

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

UNITED STATES AND SOVIET NUCLEAR SUBMARINE PROGRAMS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the June 10, 1968, edition of the State newspaper of Columbia, S.C., contains an excellent editorial entitled "Beneath the Surface."

The editorial is devoted to a warning given by Adm. Hyman G. Rickover in Charleston, S.C., when he discussed the United States and Soviet nuclear submarine programs. The main point of Admiral Rickover's warning was that the Department of Defense, under former Secretary of Defense McNamara, had ordered a freeze on attack submarine construction to take effect when the 69th nuclear attack submarine was launched. The admiral warned that this policy still dominates official thinking, and that it was a part of the McNamara legacy being carried out so faithfully by his many Assistant Secretaries who still inhabit the Pentagon.

The admiral warned also of the disturbing number of Soviet submarines now in evidence around the world's oceans. Also, he stated that the Soviets are producing faster and quieter nuclear submarines which will soon approach or even surpass the best in the U.S. submarine inventory.

I am quite familiar with Admiral Rickover's problem. I have discussed the matter with him personally and, as a result, have questioned Secretary of Defense Clifford and other defense officials in depth regarding their intentions with respect to new submarine construction. It is my earnest hope that this line of approach, combined with public opinion as reflected in this excellent editorial, will serve as the catalyst to stir up the necessary action in the Pentagon.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to this excellent editorial and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENEATH THE SURFACE

Unless Washington moves at something like flank speed, Admiral Hyman G. Rickover warned last week in Charleston, the Soviet Union may outgun the U.S. nuclear submarine force within five years. This was not the first time the admiral had sounded this alarm, but so far the Administration has failed to respond.

Instead, it adheres to the old and largely discredited McNamara formula of restraint. Former Defense Secretary McNamara was persuaded that this country enjoyed a sizeable edge in nuclear sub development, an advantage that was likely to continue. He seems to have dismissed intelligence reports that indicated furious activity at Soviet shipbuilding yards where nuclear submarines were known to be under development.

At the time, the United States had about 40 missile-armed Polaris subs and a smaller but growing number of attack subs designed to put the enemy undersea force out of commission in the event of war. The Soviet nuclear navy was considerably smaller, and McNamara was convinced that Russia, historically a half-pint naval power, would continue to lag far behind. He therefore ordered a freeze on attack sub construction to take effect when the 69th ship slid down the ways.

This policy still dominates official thinking, and the McNamara phaseout of nuclear construction is still official policy. Under the existing unhurried timetable, the nation's last nuclear attack submarine is to be launched in 1973.

Meanwhile, evidence continues to accumulate on the growing Soviet threat to American underwater dominance. Accurate estimates are hard to come by, but it is known that the Russians are engaged in a crash program of construction and development. They are catching up with the U.S. nuclear fleet in numbers, and "they will soon be ahead of us," as Admiral Rickover warned Wednesday, unless Washington acts fast.

Even more disturbing than the increasing number of Soviet subs is the evidence of their speed and efficiency. America's Polaris and attack subs are little changed from the original design. But the Soviet Union is producing ever-faster and ever-quieter ships, a particular advantage where the hunter-killer subs are concerned. Quite obviously, these submarines were designed with but a single purpose in mind: to seek out and destroy America's 41 Polaris submarines should the decision ever be made to order a Soviet first-strike against the United States.

It is a frightening possibility. As long as the nation's Polaris fleet is able to launch a massive counterattack against any aggressor, the United States enjoys considerable security from attack. But in the face of a growing Soviet attack force and with production of U.S. attack subs frozen at an arbitrary 69, that security is subject to grave doubt.

Conventional missiles, being stationary, are always vulnerable, and the constantly mobile SAC bombers already are being eliminated. The Polaris force thus becomes the nation's first line of defense. It cannot be jeopardized without an ensuing threat to the survival of the United States.

Admiral Rickover's warning cannot safely be ignored.

FLAG DAY, 1968: A REMINDER OF OUR PRICELESS HERITAGE

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in these trying times, Americans can take strength in harking back to our national heritage.

If we reflect briefly on the struggles which have made this great Nation the symbol of freedom throughout the world, we better understand the tasks which we are now undertaking to insure that men shall not be ruled by tyranny.

Mr. Budd W. Boyer of the Pompano Beach Sun-Sentinel, in commenting on our flag, said:

To stand as free people beneath the legacy of our flag, and to have the privilege of saying "I am an American and that is my flag," is an honor for which every citizen of this nation should daily give thanks."

I think Mr. Boyer has caught the spirit of our flag and I would at this time like to include for the interest and information of my colleagues Mr. Boyer's editorial from the June 14 edition of the Sun-Sentinel, as follows:

FLAG DAY, 1968: A REMINDER OF OUR PRICELESS HERITAGE

(By Budd W. Boyer)

The flag of our nation is 191 years old today, but the spirit which it embodies is as old as the first desire for freedom welling in the breast of men who suffered the yoke of tyranny.

More than an emblem to designate the origin of a vessel in foreign ports, greater than an insignia to represent a ruling group, finer than a banner to indicate a special cause, the American flag is symbolic of rights and privileges which only a self-governed people could attain.

Those who established the nation to which the flag belongs were of diverse backgrounds and nationalities. Yet in common cause and with resolute purpose to not only obtain their goal but to assure its preservation for posterity, they cast off their other ties and became one free people in a new land of promise.

On June 14, 1777, the chosen representatives of the new nation adopted the design for a flag. There in the Continental Congress, Old Glory was born from the hearts and minds of men who had suffered, sacrificed and finally triumphed in pursuit of freedom.

With such a heritage, with the inspiration of fierce patriotism burning in the souls of the creators, with the great potential of this experiment in democratic process even then apparent, the American flag was indeed a child of destiny.

And the child grew with the nation. There was an awkward age, when succeeding Congresses determined to add to dimensions of the flag as new areas attained statehood. But as it became evident such experiments were impractical, the flag was restored to its original conception, with bright stars on the blue field being added to mark each state.

Child of destiny, product of sacrifice and inspiration, heritage of hope and faith, the American flag was born of a driving necessity to throw off strangling chains of enslavement, and would face perilous paths and tribulations to survive.

But as there were men and women who had placed material possession and life itself below the overriding will to seek freedom, if not for themselves then for their children and their children's children, so were there others to sustain that will.

Always there were men to whom life was not so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery. Always there were women who would step to the cannon's mouth and load the charge in defense of freedom when their men fell wounded on the battlefield.

Oh, what has been the inspiration of this starry banner, and what has been the response as the years rolled on? In the light of battle and in quiet corners of the nation's shrines, ready to die for the flag, ready to support the principles embodied in the flag, ready to pay tribute to the patriots who kept the flag, the men and women of America have been legion.

From the land of birth, the American flag

has carried the message of a free people's strength and accomplishment to the corners of the earth, to the depths of the seas and toward the boundless infinity of space.

And wherever it has traveled the flames of hope have burned brighter for others who dare to seek the path to freedom. Borne by Americans of every color and creed, the flag has led the way as aggression, ignorance, pestilence and despotism fell back before the invincible force of right, truth and knowledge.

This is what the American flag has come to mean to the world. Representative of a free people in a free land who are willing to share the bounty that freedom has produced.

Not that a free people are infallible in all they do, but that they are as willing to confront their own shortcomings and seek and attain solutions, no matter how difficult, as they are to aid others. This too is a part of the heritage which is symbolized by the American flag.

There have been, and still are, those who would desecrate and despoil the symbol of America, seeking in this way to insult the nation. Those who do this, act as much through ignorance of what the flag truly represents as they do through the spite of immature violence that reflects a lack of capacity to be worthy of a priceless heritage of self-determination.

To stand as free people beneath the legacy of our flag, and to have the privilege of saying "I am an American and that is my flag" is an honor for which every citizen of this nation should daily give thanks.

For the right, as Americans, to pledge allegiance to the flag and to the Republic for which it stands, each of us should dedicate at every opportunity, as did those who preserved for us the right, all that is ours including life. For only free people have this choice and only so long as Old Glory waves will it be ours.

IS IT TIME THAT CONGRESS GUIDE OUR WAR POLICIES?

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, a letter recently written by a friend of mine, Larry Doyle, was published in the Minot, N. Dak., Daily News.

In his letter, Mr. Doyle comments on an editorial that appeared in the Minot Daily News in 1935 which gave an uncanny and accurate prediction of another world war in the making.

Mr. Doyle's concern that the present troubled world could lead to another world war is shared by a great many people, and he gives some good advice as to how to avoid it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS IT TIME THAT CONGRESS GUIDE OUR WAR POLICIES?

EDITOR, THE NEWS:

The old Cramond Hotel at Rugby, which for many years has been a landmark on Main Street is being torn down. This is an old frame structure which has stood for years until fire gutted the interior a couple of years ago. While being a sidewalk superin-

tendent I happened across The Minot Daily News printed Monday evening, March 25, 1935. It contained a news item headed "Cuba Will Give Medals to American Soldiers Who Fought Back in '98". It had an ad for the old Strand Theatre, admission 15 cents. It contained a picture of Minot Model Beaver Kits for 1935: Bill Stevens, J. Allen, Tim Sullivan, Paul Krueger, Bob Chatfield, H. Pickens, Reuben Hammond, Bill Hubbard, L. Birdsell, Kenneth Chatfield, Bob White, student manager and coach W. D. Allen.

What caught my eye the most was an editorial headed "Choosing Sides". First paragraph states: "Things seem to be shaping up again in Europe for another fresh jolly war, as Kaiser Wilhelm used to say. There are again as in 1914 two groups lining up against each other." The editorial went on to reveal that it was Germany again along with several allies Germany hoped would be on her side who were to be pitted against the world again. It described how Germany would be encircled by an iron ring of a new alliance which would squeeze the fight out of her. It stated France had the strongest fighting force of the day and was in league with Russia. It stated Italy would stand with France and England, would also ally with France. It was noted by the editor that Germany wanted smaller countries to join her in a suicide pact. It also stated: "As for America what are we to do—one thing, keep out of it—our side is the outside."

We all can see now how close the editor came to prophesying the initial steps and outcome of World War II. With a few exceptions it turned out to be a suicide pact for Germany and her allies without any great gain for the world except it rid the universe of a madman.

Maybe our United States Congress should take heed and start using their authoritative powers to guide our present hot and cold wars to a peaceful conclusion.

LARRY DOYLE.

MINOT.

GARY, IND.: A LAW-ABIDING AMERICAN CITY

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, these articles recently in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by two of our colleagues written by an apparently unknown author, John J. Synon, narrated a list of fantastic charges about crime and lawlessness in Gary, Ind.

The crime records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in reports issued by J. Edgar Hoover in 1966 records Gary, Ind., far above the average American cities with over 100,000 population.

To wit, 1966: 153 American cities had more burglaries—breaking and entering; 107 American cities had more larceny—over \$50; 61 American cities had more robberies—holdups; and, 50 American cities had more murders and manslaughters than Gary, Ind.

Gary's population is made up of all nationalities with a majority of the black race.

These facts reveal that for an urban, industrial area made up of many nationality groups, Gary, Ind., is far above the average in anticrime and law enforcement than many rural urban centers throughout our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I have received a great number of letters and communications protesting the articles this myterious John J. Synon has written. Mr. Synon seems to have some special bitterness against the city of Gary, Ind., and I include with my remarks a letter from Mr. David Sheer, 718 North Hamilton Street, Gary, Ind.

GARY, IND.,
June 4, 1968.

HON. RAY J. MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MADDEN: Through the familiar process well known to the trade as "extensions of remarks", thousands of articles and speeches make their way into the Congressional Record. Most of them are in good taste and reflect their high level of sponsorship. When occasional "slips" do occur, it is hoped that the pointing out of the offense and the offender will lead to its correction.

On Thursday, May 9, 1968, Congressman James B. Utt of California sponsored a series of four articles concerning the hopelessness of life in a city which had suffered a breakdown in law enforcement. They were authored by John J. Synon and carried the title: Gary: A City Without Hope. Gary's record for law enforcement and anticrime will compare far above most urban areas in the nation.

Gary, withal, has had no race riots and none are foreseen.

John J. Synon used an old bag of tricks to poison the air, the old and familiar technique of the big lie and guilt by association. Richard Gordon Hatcher was elected mayor of Gary, but he was not elected mayor of Gary, Indiana because Gary is 65 per cent black. About 62 per cent of the student body attending the Gary public schools are Negro, but this is at least 15 per cent above the average for the entire population and this figure does not include parochial and other schools. The Negro population is also younger than the white and a smaller portion of the Negro population would be of voting age.

Nearly 40,000 people came to the new Twentieth Century city between 1910-1920. The "skyline of steel" became the city's magic symbol in that decade.

By August, 1944, it was estimated that Gary had a population of more than 120,000 people. According to the 1940, national census, Gary had one of the largest foreign born populations per total population to be found in the United States.

Gary is the story of people; it is the story of the meeting of many ways of life and what they have done to get along with one another. James H. Baldwin, when he was president of the National Urban League, pointed out that "Because clashes are sensational, they are apt to dominate the news of interracial developments, while the evidence and scope of cooperation between the races are the light still hid under the bushel."

"It is essential in the national interest that this light be exposed . . ."

People came here in search of jobs; they stayed on to make homes and raise families. They thrived here. Other industries came, other artisans, professional men, retail stores, banks, publishing houses. People constantly talked of peaceful living. They talked of how to make their lives more attractive.

As a community, since the late '30s, we have worked hard for the improvement in the lives of all our people. Latin-Americans and others usually listed as minorities have already begun to assist one another to improved job opportunities through study, education, and occupational self-discipline. There is a growing perception that we will all win or lose through our success or failure to recognize the rights of the least privileged

Negro minority. Democracy necessarily includes all.

The fact that there has been no violence in Gary may be more due to a high degree of intelligence and sophistication in the Negro and white leadership than to apathy. There is a sharp recognition of the points at conflict. There is also an understanding of the need for continuous negotiation. There is also a growing sense for the need for the feeling of community of spirit in all parts of the city.

There is no evidence of any breakdown in the enforcement of the law in Gary, Indiana. The Northwest Indiana Crime Commission, a private agency, looked with favor upon the choice of James Hilton as Chief of Police. His choice was considered a good one by most of the business community and by most churchmen. There is a shortage of police personnel, however, and efforts are being made to rectify this condition.

What we are accomplishing now is much more important than all of what was done in the past. The revitalizing of the downtown area, the slum dwellings that have already been torn down, the slum dwellings that will come down in the immediate future, and the construction of new homes. We have the knowledge that people of diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds can live and work together. We know that there is simply no reconciling democratic living and racist practices. Without hope, without the mutual sharing of the Gary dream, all that there would be is frustration.

We need inspiration, knowledge and skills for the years to come. We must keep our schools democratic with integrated, quality education. We must continue to raise the education level of adults and school dropouts with evening classes. We must maintain a climate conducive to the continued growth of Northwest Campus of Indiana University.

The teaching profession is given the dedicated task of leading this generation to believe in, struggle for, and to attain freedom. More than that! It is the continuing responsibility of all of us to develop a working knowledge of what constitutes good behavior and to live every day according to these beliefs. Without at least a high-school education, it is almost impossible for one to get a job. There is an increasing pressure upon the individual to go on to college. Knowledge is the road to freedom. Come, let us march together. We are all Americans.

The democratic way is the pursuit of the methods of reason and intelligence in all things. That is why we have been equal to the task of maintaining a peaceful community. That is why we will be equal to the continuous task of rebuilding homes, neighborhoods, schools, and business establishments.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID SHEER.

A SUGGESTED FOREIGN POLICY

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, there is much talk abroad in the land concerning the conduct of our foreign policy. Some of it is merely campaign rhetoric; some is the result of careful thinking, analysis, and reflection. The problems besetting America today are not simple and therefore do not submit to simple answers.

Mr. William R. Mathews, of the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., has done a comprehensive job of outlining some of the problems we face in foreign relations around the world. Mr. President, I think it would be helpful if the Senate had the benefit of his analysis, so I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "A Suggested Foreign Policy," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SUGGESTED FOREIGN POLICY

(By William R. Mathews)

We are literally stuck in Vietnam. Our big problem today is to get unstuck. It is going to be a much longer and more difficult job to do that than most of us realize. In any event, there is no use crying over spilt milk. We should learn how to retrieve a mistake.

Our plight calls for a review of our foreign policy in general. Our obsession that we must protect all nations from aggression and come to the help of nations whose freedom is being threatened is wrong. That policy began with President Harry S. Truman and has been publicly reiterated by Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson. That policy is that it is the American duty to come to the help of freedom everywhere it is menaced! That policy took us into Vietnam. I could never understand how Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy could take us into far-off Vietnam "to stop Communism," but evade doing anything about nearby Cuba.

If we are to avoid such tragic mistakes in the future, we must use as a basis the everlasting self-interest of our country. Only by making clear the obvious self-interest of our country, can any American government in the future unite our country behind a wise foreign policy.

That in turn requires a flexible policy that recognizes first of all our vital self-interests. Today our vital self-interests might be outlined by the frontier reaching from Alaska, Hawaii, Panama Canal triangle in the Pacific; and Iceland, Newfoundland, the Bahamas, Puerto Rico and the Panama Canal in the Atlantic.

Next come our primary interests whose frontier in the Pacific reaches from the Aleutians to Japan, Korea, Okinawa, Taiwan, to the Philippines, Singapore and the Straits of Malacca. The whole Pacific Ocean area behind that island perimeter reaching down to Cape Horn includes our primary interests. We are the policeman of that area. Through the instrumentality of our Navy we assert our responsibility and authority.

The Atlantic Ocean area, which includes the British Isles, the North Sea and the NATO countries and the South Atlantic, marks our primary interests in Europe. These primary interests can become vital interests overnight. They are that important.

However, they are distinguished in the European area by sharing responsibility as allies. In the Pacific we do not have allies of military importance, whereas in Europe we do.

Finally, comes the recognition of our remote interests. They comprise the continent of Asia, the Indian Ocean and African countries. Certainly we must be interested in all of this area, but never as a military ally of any Asiatic or African nation. We must never land troops anywhere at any time on the continent of Asia and Africa.

Asia has more than half of the people of the world. Purely on the basis of its overwhelming manpower we can never win a military decision there. What would happen is happening today in Vietnam.

Our military mission in the future should be to control the sea lanes, which can be done effectively and economically with our Navy. We can and should have friendly relations with the nations of Asia and Africa, but stay out of the fights and squabbles that are bound to break out from time to time. If we base our foreign policy on the fundamental of self-interest, our chances of getting involved in another remote, indecisive war will be greatly reduced.

We also must realize that history shows that there has always been present what I call predatory powers, governments that seek to expand their authority by deliberately provoking wars. The past 54 years of history, which include World Wars I and II, and Korea, have seen this take place repeatedly, as the victims sought to defend themselves. We went to the help of the victims, because we unconsciously knew that we would have to fight the predators alone if they achieved their ambitions.

There are two predatory powers in the world today—the Soviet Union and Red China. If it had not been for the Marshall Plan and our military power, the Soviet Union would have overrun all of Western Europe. As one who was in Greece in June of 1947, and Italy, Germany, France and Britain months later, I saw how close Soviet Communist imperialism came to doing just that.

We must never forget October of 1962, when Moscow was caught installing missiles with a range that could reach our big cities and industries. That ambitious act shows how recklessly Moscow has misjudged the United States.

We must remember that at this minute Moscow has thousands of party cells throughout the world. By coming to the help of Cuba she proved how she would support "wars of liberation" everywhere. She means what she preaches, as she makes Egypt one of her more-promising satellites. That is why in our own self-interest we must have enough military power to command the respect of the Soviet Union and China.

Any discussion of China should be based on the fact that China rivals Egypt in being one of the first great civilizations with a 6,000-year written history. China has been through all kinds of periods of rebellion and conquests, but also periods of notable grandeur. She invented gunpowder, paper and the civil service for government employees. As Marco Polo described her, she had a much more affluent civilization when he visited her than did the people of Europe.

She also has a history of being a predatory power, as the conquests of Tamerlane and Genghis Khan indicate. At one time she conquered all of Vietnam. But she also has had her periods of decadence, such as her past two centuries when she bowed down to the superior forces of the European nations. During those years China was "peace-loving."

Fortunately for us, Chairman Mao, with his new militant cultural revolution, has set back China's development by at least 10 if not 25 years. His Red Guard campaign vilified intellectuals, industrial managers and Communist party leaders, and to some extent paralyzed industry and closed the schools and universities. China cannot advance politically or economically as long as this situation prevails.

Temporarily, she is a paper tiger, but she is destined within the lifetime of most of you to become a predatory power. The reason is those qualities are built into the genes of every Chinaman.

Finally, we should never lose sight of the fact that we are the wealthiest and most powerful nation in the world. Yet, if we intend to stay that way, we must not go off on searches for unlimited and unattainable political objectives beyond our power to control.

HE'S A REPORTER, SIR

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, radio station WAVA in the Washington area recently provided us with a very timely note on the whys and wherefores of some of the events of the day. I respectfully submit same for the perusal of my colleagues and, I hope, of all who avail themselves the use of this RECORD:

There is a group of people who wants riots to come to Washington. This same group is probably responsible for much of the rioting in other parts of the country. They always seem to show up anywhere in the country wherever a crowd shouts at a policeman, whenever an isolated nut takes a pot-shot at a cop. These men are not black power advocates. They're not members of any organized conspiracy. But they are men of the shadows and they are surely as much to blame for America's violence as if they had taken a loaded gun and fired it into a crowd. Who is this group?

This is Jim Russell and I'll be back in a moment with a WAVA spotlight commentary.

Americans are waking up to the real cause of their country's racial strife. They are beginning to realize that to a large extent the press of this country is guilty of inciting to riot. Even the most responsible newspaper, television or radio station is guilty. Why? Because they are being used by the so-called advocates of destruction, the burn-baby-burners, this country's most irresponsible spokesmen.

We of the press claim innocence always; after all, we are only covering the news. The people have a right to know. Well, it's about time we realized that today's civil rights militant leaders were yesterday's nobodies. We made them what they are today.

What has happened to the value of the press space and time that it is available so cheaply to every rabble rouser? It's probably true today that if I get up on a soapbox in downtown Washington screaming "burn, baby, burn," tonight I would make front page in most major newspapers and my face would be smeared on every TV screen in the country.

A good example is the case of H. Rap Brown. Brown is an intelligent, alert and totally irresponsible young man. What has happened to our sense? Have we of the press gone mad that we cater to this petty malcontent's every whim? Certainly we must cover the news, but are we crazy that we give our airtime so freely that he can spew his venom and just plain filth?

And yet every time we think we are responsible, we have only to think back to the day that Rap Brown was arrested in Alexandria. Brown's foul, stupid and irresponsible statements were seen throughout the country.

I think it's time now. I think the press must put a higher value on the spoken or televised word in print or picture. We must admonish the press, "for God's sake, respect yourselves. Don't sell your integrity down the river for a good quote."

Mr. President, you ask, as do citizens across the country, why we are having racial disturbances. You set up panels to study it. Mayors and governors and milquetoast civic leaders debate the problem. Mr. President, if you seek the cause of racial flareups don't miss the forest for the trees. The answer is closer than you think—right next to you, sir. That man approaching now—he's a reporter, sir.

"STATE OF THE UNION, 1968"—A SERMON

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, recently, at the 99th annual conclave of the Knights Templar of Kansas, the Reverend Lee Baggett, minister of the Riverside Christian Church, Wichita, Kans., delivered an excellent sermon on the subject, "State of the Union, 1968."

The sermon is a most timely discussion of the problems confronting our Nation in 1968. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF THE UNION, 1968

(Sermon delivered at the 99th annual conclave of the Knights Templar of Kansas, May 6, 1968, at Arkansas City, Kans., by grand prelate, the Reverend and Sir Knight Lee Baggett, minister, Riverside Christian Church, Wichita, Kans.—Scripture: Matthew 5: 1-16.)

I hope none of you will be overly concerned about the title of the sermon. It seems that every preacher is talking today about the state of the union and about the race problem, or Viet Nam, or poverty, or anything like this. Not directly anyway. But we need to face up to the real cause of all problems. History may well record that the greatest contribution Martin Luther King made to our society was the awareness that these are moral issues. They are not political, they are not economical, they are not social; the problems before us today demand a moral decision on the part of our people and on this scheme more of us ought to be preaching.

In my state of the union message I would begin with a note of optimism. We have never had it so good, you and I. Each day some new gadget is invented which makes life easier for us, some new medicine is discovered which makes life longer. I remember not long ago hearing Dr. Von Braun, father of the atomic bomb, saying:

"Man has progressed further in the last fifty years than in any other one thousand years of civilization."

I believe that is true. Over the same roads where our forefathers came to Kansas in covered wagons, making ten miles on a good day, we zip today in our air-conditioned automobiles at seventy miles an hour, and with all the comforts of home. With that same car we can go to Oklahoma City, Kansas City, St. Louis, Chicago, Detroit, or almost anywhere else without getting off super highways. On the site of their one-room mud huts we now have homes with soft beds, central air and heat, electric lights and dozens of other comforts.

I would remind our women folks they have never had it so good. They are surrounded by gadgets which make life easier; for example, stoves which turn themselves on, cook food until it is done, turn themselves off, and then automatically clean themselves. The refrigerators, freezers, washers, dryers and cleaners are all designed to make life easier for them. We have forgotten the old, black, iron washpot out in the back yard where clothes were boiled over a wood fire and cleaned with homemade soap—we have forgotten a wood-burning cook stove in the kitchen which had to be kindled each morning and which, in the south where I grew

up, was the only heat in the winter time. We have forgotten what it was like to have the bathroom fifty feet away from the house, especially on a bitterly cold morning. This is truly an amazing world in which we live.

I would also remind our men that they are eating high on the hog, too. We have moved from a ten-cent-an-hour wage, with no security, to a decent living for most folks. The average income per family in Wichita today is over eight thousand dollars, fifty years ago it was less than eight hundred. It is not unusual at all anymore for an average, working family to have two cars, two bathrooms and two telephones. We Americans comprise only a small part of the world population and yet we have 60% of the world's telephones, 70% of the world's cars, 80% of the world's bathtubs, and 90% of the world's electrical gadgets. We make better provision for retirement than any people in history. We can feel proud of all this.

Educationally there is no end to where our children can go. They graduate from high school today with an education equal to two years of college 25 years ago, and yet no one wants to hire them until they have a college degree. We have a higher percentage graduating from college today than did we from high school 75 years ago. Everything looks too good to be true.

And it is. In all of this prosperity and good living there is something wrong. We are not the happy people we ought to be. Fear is a part of our everyday living. On our way to the bank with our fat paychecks we keep looking behind us for someone to steal it, or overhead for some enemy bomber to blow it all up. We are so afraid of losing what we have we can't enjoy it. We have lost faith in our country and in ourselves. . . . How did it all happen? Where did it start?

Well, it didn't start in politics, and it didn't start in social conditions and it didn't start in church. Every time in history when a nation has suffered a breakdown in its honor and prestige it started in the home. Family togetherness is a thing of the past. Marriage vows have lost their sacredness, today there is one divorce to every 2.8 marriages each year. Children are left to run wild on the streets and as a result juvenile delinquency is becoming a major problem. The fault does not lie with the schools or the police or the community or with the kids, it lies with the parents! How did J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI state it:

"If parents could be made legally and financially responsible for the acts of their children, juvenile delinquency would almost disappear."

Home for them is nothing more today than a way-station where we meet to eat and sleep together. Toynbee, the world's greatest historian, records that the fall of every great civilization began with a breakdown in the home.

We have also experienced a breakdown in our national honor and integrity. In much of the world today we are hated, sometimes with cause. Demonstrations against America are a commonplace thing, our flag is being burned as often as it is being raised. Even in our own borders the cry of treason rings out as loud as that of loyalty. Where did we go wrong?

All of this has happened because we have tried to sustain a nation without God. We have forgotten that the greatness of America is founded upon the greatness of God. We have forgotten that the men who made this country great walked in the footsteps of Jesus. Our greatness is in God and we are dangerously close to losing it all because God is being discarded as an old-fashioned fuddy-duddy who is out of tune with the times.

I know the figures don't bear this out but it is true. So we have grown to where 66% of our people are members of the church and over 90% of them say they believe in God.

So what? We are having less influence on America today with this 66% than we did with 35% less than a hundred years ago. We have moved from a dedicated minority to a disinterested majority. No one has said it better than General Omar Bradley:

"Our knowledge of science has outstripped our ability to use it. We have become mental giants and moral infants. We have discovered the secret of the atom and rejected the Sermon on the Mount. The power of our weapons is more important than the power of Jesus Christ. This is our dilemma as a nation and for it we are paying a terrible price."

These are the problems. What can we do about them? Knowing the problem is no good unless you have an answer. I have one!

We need to invite Jesus Christ back into our homes. We need to dust off the family Bible and read it together. In all my years in the ministry I have never known a family who didn't say this was the hardest thing in the world for them to start, and the best part of their family life after they did start. It means doing things together, as a family. This old saying is true that the family which prays together stays together.

We also need to get Jesus Christ back into our national affairs. Things are rotten these days. They must be when a U.S. Senator is proven guilty of taking money and using it for his own self and all his colleagues do it, spank his arm gently, and then want to send to prison those who dared to expose him. Things are rotten when returning servicemen tell of vast black market operations in Viet Nam to which the authorities turn a blind eye. Things are rotten when our national capitol can become one of the most crime-infested cities in the world. Things are rotten when a frustrated preacher or movie entertainer can take advantage of a situation to humiliate the high office of the presidency of the United States. In all of this sordid mess there is no God! We need Jesus Christ walking the hallways of Congress, we need Him sitting in on conferences in the White House, we need Him handing down decisions from the Supreme Court; we need Him directing the affairs of government from every office we have. We will never again be the great nation we once were until God is invited back to share in the decisions He once helped to make.

Finally, good friends, we need to invite Jesus Christ back into the church. We are building great Temples and preaching to big crowds but in all of this there is no Holy Spirit. We need churches filled with repentant sinners instead of contented saints. . . . We need preachers filled with the Holy Spirit instead of psychology. . . . We need people saying "amen" instead of "I wonder when he is going to stop talking." . . . We need tears instead of boredom.

Jesus Christ can give us all of this and more if we will just give Him back our churches and our nation and ourselves. . . . Let us pray.

BIOGRAPHICAL

Lee Baggett was born in San Antonio, Texas, on August 27, 1917. A postal employee in Shreveport, La., for 13 years prior to entering the ministry. Holds B.A. and B.D. from TCU, Fort Worth, Texas. Pastorate at Houston, Texas, until 1964 when he came to Riverside Church in Wichita, where membership has increased to more than 600.

Sir Knight Baggett served for 3½ years in 30th Infantry Division during WW II, saw 18 months overseas; participated in 7 major campaigns, received a number of unit citations and a Bronze Star.

He holds membership in Caddo Lodge No. 179, Shreveport, La., and the York Rite in Wichita, Kansas, bodies. He is a dynamic speaker and fully alive to the problems of today.

MRS. AMY ROBINSON, OF INDIANAPOLIS, WINS COLLEGE DIPLOMA AFTER 35 YEARS

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, in 1933, Mrs. Amy Robinson of Indianapolis entered college for the first time, but lack of funds in the depression years kept her from finishing. However, for the last 8 years, she has been taking night classes at Indiana Central College, while working through the day, and received her diploma at this year's commencement exercises.

Mrs. Robinson has given an example of hard work, courage, faith, and perseverance that is certainly worthy of note, and well could be followed by others. She is to be congratulated on the example she has set and we all wish her the very best in her future.

The following story from the June 2, 1968, Indianapolis Star and the editorial from the June 4, 1968, Indianapolis News describe this remarkable woman's achievement:

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, June 2, 1968]

A COLLEGE EDUCATION

For most people it takes four years after high school to graduate from college; but for Mrs. Amy Robinson it took 35 years. She entered college in 1933 after she was graduated from Crispus Attucks but lack of funds during the depression prevented her from continuing.

Mrs. Robinson, who is 53, attended night classes at Indiana Central College for the last eight years while working days as an inspector for International Harvester Co. She earned her diploma majoring in sociology and has plans to go on for her doctorate degree.

She knows what it means to work for what she has but feels "many children today expect everything to be given to them, and I'm talking about both whites and colored." They expect everything on a silver platter, she says.

Why, after all those years, did Mrs. Robinson go back to school? "My mother (who died in 1962) insisted I go back." Her daughter, Valeria, has 12 credit hours to go for her degree at Marian College.

Mrs. Robinson had another reason for obtaining more education, one which she had learned firsthand. "Power is education," she notes. "Through that we (Negroes) can get green power (money) and through money we can gain other achievements."

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) News, June 4, 1968]

MRS. ROBINSON'S DIPLOMA HAS A SPECIAL MEANING

(By Josef H. Hebert)

Mrs. Amy Robinson has a message.

And when the 53-year-old Negro mother steps forth to receive her college diploma tonight at Indiana Central College commencement that message, she says, should be apparent:

Stay in school.

For Mrs. Robinson, 3432 Asbury Road, the diploma in sociology marks an achievement of goals pounded into the bloodstream by parents who held the value of an education second to none.

That quality was a rare one in the years of Mrs. Robinson's rearing. The depths of the Great Depression loomed ominously when she was graduated from high school in 1933. She is a native of Indianapolis.

"Back during the Depression I wanted to be a lawyer but had to drop out after three weeks. What was the use of going to school in the Depression, I thought. But my mother insisted that I go back."

Bleak days of poverty followed by procrastination prevented her return to the classroom until 1960 when she enrolled in Indiana Central's night classes, against the insistence of her mother—herself a one-time teacher in Nashville, Tenn.

Mrs. Robinson's mother died in 1962 but "knew I was going to finish (college) because I promised her I would," she said.

"I think the desire of an education is somewhat maternal with us. It has the most force."

Mrs. Robinson is not the only member of the family "bent on getting an education." Her sister, Eddie Lee Durham, 1001 West 35th Street, has three years of college and Mrs. Durham's daughter, Jo Ann, is a teacher in a Vermillion (S.D.) high school.

Mrs. Robinson's daughter, Valeria, says she will return to Marian College next fall. She needs only a dozen credit hours for a degree.

"I suppose I too preach the gospel of education, just like Dr. King," Mrs. Robinson says.

"Many children today expect everything to be given to them and I'm talking about both whites and colored. I remember times when I didn't know where the next penny was coming from for my tuition."

"I don't expect anything to be given to me on a platter just because I'm colored."

For more than 28 years Mrs. Robinson has worked as an inspector with International Harvester Company. But in the last eight years she has spent her evenings at Indiana Central College.

Now she has high hopes of doing something relating to her degree.

"I'd love to work with minority groups—the American Indian or the Negro."

Her most fervent teachings will center around the need for an education.

"I'd like to talk to all the children—not just the colored. So many of them think that all is just fun," she says, alluding to some young person's lack of concern for school, "Why if it hadn't been for Sputnik—what would our future have been?"

Again she refers to today's youngsters "expecting everything on a silver platter" and proposes that the militants of the civil rights movement are in this category.

"They can call it black power or anything else they want to, but the power is education. Through that we can get green power (money) and through money we can gain other achievements."

Mrs. Robinson has come a long way since she was graduated from Public School No. 13, entered Crispus Attucks High School in the 1920s and made her first attempt at higher education in 1933.

She is a member of the drama honorary society at Indiana Central, a key force in Citizens' Forum, Inc., has served on the Governor's Commission on the Status of Women.

She also is a tireless worker in local labor union affairs and says one day she would like to "go to Africa as an ambassador of good will."

The trip, she explains, would be under the Social Technical and Education Program of the United Automobile Workers (UAW).

Asked if she is seeking a master's degree she replied:

"Now I'd like a doctorate—I guess it's just like a slide because you just want to keep going."

THE HEADMASTER RETIRES

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have risen more than once before to speak of my great and good friend, Dr. Frank L. Boyden, the outstanding and dedicated headmaster of Deerfield Academy. Not least among these occasions was our meeting last October 11. At that time, many of my colleagues in both Chambers also paid tribute to the beloved headmaster on the announcement of his intention to retire from the academy which he had headed for 12 years.

The RECORD already holds the account of his life of distinguished service unparalleled in the history of education. I fear that more words can little add to fulfilling the debt all of us owe to this humble individual possessed of a quiet understanding.

I had the pleasure of nominating Frank Boyden in April for the New England Council Award for an individual of singularly distinguished service which benefited his fellow citizens. I could think of no one who better fulfilled these qualifications.

But the time has arrived. Dr. Frank Boyden has this month retired from the academy he loved so much and to whose students and alumni he was so endeared. A tribute to him entitled "In Appreciation" appearing in the Greenfield Recorder of June 11, expresses the love and debt of gratitude felt by those who lived and worked closest with him. I am sure that it will not be the last tribute to this great man for his influence will long be felt and his service to other universities, his town, and the Nation will continue. But I insert this latest expression of appreciation in the RECORD in another attempt to put in words what this man means to so many.

IN APPRECIATION

More startling events took place on the world news scene last week but few matched in significance the retirement from Deerfield Academy leadership of Dr. and Mrs. Frank L. Boyden.

Great men from the fields of government and education have waxed eloquent in their tributes to the Boydens. Humanitarians, sociologists and public figures for the past several weeks have voiced their individual and collective appreciation. Graduates of the famous school have sent messages of love and respect to the couple who meant so much to them.

This newspaper today, in the post-commencement hush that has fallen over Deerfield's meadows, adds an editorial note of respect and gratitude for many years of association with Dr. and Mrs. Boyden. Its staff members—three of whom are numbered among "Mr. Boyden's boys"—have been privileged to be neighbors over the years. Many of us have been guests and have shared in Deerfield activities.

Newspaper persons are inclined to view the world's great skeptically. They have a different relationship with such persons than that of the reader. They see public figures offstage and in private times of irritation, uncertainty and pettiness. They view heroes' off-guarded moments.

We have found Dr. and Mrs. Boyden to be very real human beings. But they are of a special type. Both possess unusual qualities of humaneness and quiet understanding that set them apart. They have had the ability to look deeply beneath the surface of situations, of events and persons. And their own innate goodness has allowed them to arrive at conclusions that were both logical and of lasting benefit.

The Boydens are not—and never have been—the naive little folks many sophisticates have delighted in picturing them. But they have not allowed their own intellects to blind them to the verities of life and of human nature. In their quiet fashion, they have challenged the vain, the stubborn and the selfish thousands of times over the years. Not always have they been victorious but their triumphs have been many and the losers in such conflicts have eventually gained by the lesson.

Frank and Helen Boyden built far more than a fine school at Deerfield Academy. They have sent out into the adult world thousands of boys and girls who were better for their experience there. By their personal examples, they have instilled in the hearts of others an understanding of life's real values. Through their activities as citizens, they have encouraged their neighbors to make Franklin County a more humane society.

For all these gifts we thank them. For their kindnesses we make known our lasting appreciation. And for their lessons in the art of living, we pledge in a small way our efforts to spread the gospel better understanding among men.

THE POOR PEOPLE'S CAMPAIGN

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Friends of Poor People's Campaign, an organization working to coordinate support for the goals delineated by the late Dr. Martin Luther King and the Poor People's Campaign among such organizations as Americans for Democratic Action, American Civil Liberties Union, Peace Action Council, Women for Legislative Action, SANE, and others, has brought to me approximately 600 petitions signed by over 6,000 concerned individuals.

The petitions have been circulated primarily in Los Angeles and other southern California communities, but signatures are included also from other parts of California and other Western States.

I wish to commend this group of dedicated citizens for their efforts on behalf of those who seek a way out of poverty and despair. At their request I am presenting these petitions to Speaker McCormack and to Chairman PERKINS of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

The text of the petition is as follows:

We, the people, petition our Government in support of the Poor People's Campaign: to end war, poverty, and racism.

Whereas, the richest country in the world spends only 11% of its budget for health, education, and welfare; and 79% on wars past, present, and future . . .

And because of these reversed priorities

30 million Americans are forced to lead lives of poverty and despair—

We, the undersigned, therefore urge our elected representatives to adopt those recommendations of the Commission on Civil Disorders which would create two million new jobs, provide decent living standards for all who cannot work, make decent housing available to low and middle-income families, and desegregate all schools.

Additionally, we urge passage in full of the legislative program of the Poor People's Washington Campaign, which, in the name of humanity and justice, is calling for a bill of economic and social rights.

We demand: an end to the War in Vietnam; a commitment to justice.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., 1929-1968: "There is nothing, except a tragic death wish, to prevent us from re-ordering our priorities, so that the pursuit of peace will take precedence over the pursuit of war. There is nothing to keep us from re-molding a recalcitrant status-quo with bruised hands until we have fashioned it into a brotherhood."

RIOTS BLAMED ON COMMUNISM

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, some time ago the Corpus Christi Caller Times of Corpus Christi, Tex., carried a letter to the editor from Julio L. Morales, of Kingsville, Tex. Mr. Morales is a Cuban refugee. I submit his statement to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

RIOTS BLAMED ON COMMUNISM

EDITOR, THE CALLER:

The racial upheaval is making America more and more conscious that there are hidden powers working in its midst to destroy peace and order, create turmoil, build social cleavage, turn brother against brother and make this a hell of a place to live.

I have been noticing the advance of the colored minority war and have been predicting to my friends that this was coming up at a fast step. I am not a prophet. I am just a Cuban refugee, a refugee of the subterfuge tactics of communism, that socialist monster that works in the dark and never lets down till you wake up to be too late.

Editors and correspondents are trying to look for an explanation. They can't understand why we should have a civil war here. They write articles full of beautiful words asking for community spirit, common sense, more responsibility, campaigning for love of brother, mutual respect among different skin-colored people and what not. What a waste of typewriter ribbon! . . .

Do not call this movement an extremist Negro manifestation or a reflection of poor people's unrest. Colored people are good at heart and capable of living in harmony with their white brothers. Don't be ridiculous. Don't buy a gun to defend your store or your house. The rock thrower is not being pushed by a sentiment of discrimination. Sadly enough to say he is the useful idiot of the Communist conspiracy at work.

All of you work to convince your colored brother that he is being dragged into this civil war (that has cost \$150 million in Detroit) by the dark hand of communism. I abhor the prospects of going through a Communist takeover a second time.

JULIO L. MORALES.

KINGSVILLE.

FREE ENTERPRISE AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to read a speech delivered by the distinguished Senator from Iowa, the Honorable JACK MILLER, on the role of free enterprise in the area of hospitalization.

Senator MILLER, in speaking before the Federation of American Hospitals in California, eloquently depicted the important function private hospitals play in the care of the sick and the injured in our society.

I am personally aware of the great services private hospitals and their dedicated staffs perform in my district of south Florida as well as throughout our great Nation. It is for this reason that I commend this speech by Senator MILLER. It will give my colleagues an unusual insight into these institutions of free enterprise and the humanitarian work in which they are engaged:

FREE ENTERPRISE AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

(By U.S. Senator Jack Miller, Republican of Iowa)

I am both pleased and highly honored to have the opportunity of appearing on the splendid program of this, your second national convention.

The purpose of the convention stated in your convention program is most laudable and worthy of the support of any professional organization. And it is deserving of the praise of all tax-paying, community-supporting individuals and organizations.

Over the past twenty years, the number of proprietary hospitals has decreased, while the number of nonprofit or tax exempt hospitals has made a substantial increase. At the same time, however, the number of beds in proprietary hospitals has shown a rate of increase equal to that of the nonprofit hospitals. The conclusion is inescapable that well-managed proprietary hospitals not only play a significant role in the health care of the citizens of many of our communities, but there is a future for them—provided, of course, that future is not jeopardized by future events which no one can foresee or by events which can be foreseen and not prevented from taking place.

Free enterprise, or capitalism, is an ingredient of the American Way of Life which is most meaningful to me. My great grandfather was an Iowa grain and livestock farmer—and a capitalist. My grandfather was a Nebraska grain and livestock farmer—and a capitalist. My father worked for over forty years for one of our large corporations, and of course he served those who had risked their capital for the sake of profit. I began my career in the Washington, D.C., headquarters of the Internal Revenue Service where my job was to help see that the federal government received its fair share of profits. Then I taught some of the sons of capitalists, who wanted their offspring to become lawyers to see that justice was done to capitalists. Next I was a practicing tax lawyer, and my job was to see to it that the government received no more than its fair share of profits. And now I am in Washington again, but never did I dream a few years ago that I would have to be fighting to keep this marvelous profit system—capitalism-free enterprise—from being eroded away.

The economic system of the United States

has always been capitalism. It is inherent in our inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The concept of "freedom" includes the ownership of the means of production and the right to the fruits of one's labors and investment in business. This is why the capitalistic economic system is properly called the "free enterprise" system. Take it away, and freedom is taken away, and the American Way of Life is taken away.

Naturally our freedoms are not absolute. There is no absolute right of free speech, for example. I learned a long time ago in law school that freedom of speech does not cover abuse of free speech by libel or slander, or by yelling "fire" in a crowded theater just for kicks. Our capitalistic economic system is not the absolute, laissez-faire type which was found in many European countries. Rather, because of certain government restrictions such as the anti-trust laws, and, I should add, certain government assistance in many areas, such as land grants to railroads, river and harbor development for water and barge transportation, and FHA and SBA loans to farmers and small businessmen, and the unique situation where many of the workers in plants own shares of stock in those same plants—because of these phenomena, our system is more familiarly known as "people's capitalism". Its results for our people, not to mention others in numerous countries around the world which have received our foreign aid, have become the envy of the world. Why would any American wish to destroy it?

But I don't need to remind this audience that events have been taking place, particularly in respect to our federal government, which either have jeopardized or can, if not controlled, jeopardize our economic system. Some historians and economists tell us that the growth of our Central Government has been spurred by technological, economic, and social changes which have brought with them new conditions and new problems. But there are philosophers and students of character who suggest that at least a part of this growth in the Central Government—and a very significant part—is the result of diminishing understanding and appreciation of our heritage of freedom—of loss of faith, so to speak, in those guidelines of our forebears—individual effort, free choice, and a willingness to take risks because of the incentive of greater abundance.

This appears to have all started during the depression of the 1930s. Over half our population has been born since that period; and although these younger generations have never been called upon to demonstrate their staying power in a period of hard times, they have inherited a strong desire for security from their parents, many of whom had very rough going during the depression. The fear among the people generated by that catastrophe became the prey of politicians, planners, and brain trusters who were quite ready, willing, and able to throw away a one hundred and fifty year old tradition of solid values and accomplishments for the expedience of a myriad of untried ideas. Some of them did work. Others were merely given the appearance of working. Failures were quickly buried by new ideas and new hopes. World War II came along and rescued the theoreticians from their tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect strategy which was beginning to crumble. But the damage to our character had taken root. Those who were faithful to the true values were muted by their own doubts or drowned out by the advertising and promotion of the New Deal, the Fair Deal, the New Frontier, and, lately, by the so-called Great Society.

Feelings of doubt and insecurity of the people transferred the search for economic security from ourselves to the Central Government, leading to all kinds of federal programs and hundreds upon hundreds of thousands of federal employees to administer

them. In the last seven years, 578,000 civilians have been added to the federal payroll, and your federal government has spent over \$55 billion more than its income. But the feelings of doubt and insecurity certainly haven't gone away. During these last seven years many laws and programs have been enacted by a Congress which has existed not as an independent, coequal branch of our government, but as a subservient rubber stamp of the Executive Branch. The sole tests of some of these laws and programs have been: Will they get results? Are they constitutional? The test should have been: "Assuming they will get results and assuming they are constitutional, will they strengthen or weaken our national character as a people?"

I place the character problem first in this analysis, because it is basic to everything. More directly related to the free enterprise system are certain activities of the federal government which directly compete with private industry or serve to undercut it. Let me make clear that this is not a criticism of all that the federal government does with respect to the private sector. Were it not for the Small Business Administration, many capitalistic endeavors would not have been born or succeeded. Were it not for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, hundreds of thousands of homes would not have been built by private industry. Were it not for the Securities and Exchange Act, thousands of investors would have suffered losses of millions of dollars. But when the federal government, and to a lesser extent the state and local governments, competes with the very system it was established to serve and protect, there is cause of concern. Most of us will not argue with the operation of some business-type activities by the government, and this is particularly true when for one reason or another such activities cannot be reasonably carried on by private risk capital. But it is quite another matter when government moves into areas already occupied by private business. Attempts were only mildly successful during the Eisenhower Administration to get the federal government out of some of the more than 19,000 commercial and industrial activities into which it had moved; and the number was reduced to 17,000. But since 1960 the number has climbed to 24,000. They cover a wide range:

The generation and sale of electric power; extending credit to business and industry; the manufacture of rum, fertilizer, helium, rubber, lumber, sleeping bags, false teeth, flags, and ships; rail, air, and marine transport, blueprinting, printing, and bookbinding; the operation of hotels and laundries; scrap processing and tire retreading; baking, window washing, dry cleaning; and so on.

A report by the Government Operations Committee of the Senate in 1963 noted that these activities were capitalized in excess of \$12 billion; other reports place the true value at figures from \$30 billion to \$150 billion. In 1965, these federal business enterprises contributed \$5 billion to the total national income and employed nearly 700,000 people. In the state and local government sectors, business activities produced \$2.4 billion, with employment of 417,000. As a percentage of national totals, these figures are not large, but their steady upward growth is disturbing.

Somewhat related to government competition is the competition by tax exempt foundations and organizations. For a long time it has been the policy of our federal government to grant an income tax exemption to non-profit organizations engaged in certain activities beneficial to the general public, and for state and local governments to grant income and property tax exemptions, respectively, to such organizations. The underlying philosophy has been that were it not for such exemptions, the activities could not be taken over by private enterprise and would, therefore, have to be carried on by govern-

ment; and that it would be better not to have them carried on by government. I understand this is a sensitive area for proprietary hospitals, many of which voluntarily absorb some of the community problems without adequate, and sometimes without any, compensation. But I must point out that this has been on a voluntary and not a compulsory basis—just as the community services rendered by many industrial corporations have been.

Government regulation of certain types of public utilities is another large area of continuing controversy—not so much any more with the long-accepted idea that basic services to the general public should be furnished on a low-cost, moderate profit basis—such as public transportation, telephone, electric, water, and sanitation services—not so much with the idea itself as with the rates fixed by the government. Nevertheless, the possible abuses of a monopoly over essential services has been regarded as sufficient reason for allowing reasonable rates to be set.

Members of Congress are becoming increasingly aware of a somewhat analogous problem in the field of higher education. Here there are very few institutions which are not tax exempt—either because they are non-profit or governmental. But taxpayers who send their children to the non-profit institutions do not derive direct benefit of the taxes paid by them for the support of government institutions, so that tuition and other costs are generally much higher. It has been forecast that most of these private, non-profit educational institutions will be in a serious financial situation a few years from now simply because of the competition from government institutions. As you know, the demand for tax relief of parents in the form of an income tax credit has been very loud, and when the federal budget permits, it is my guess this demand will be answered.

Moving closer to home, cash payments by the federal government in the broad category of health amounted to over \$10 billion last year, including \$2.4 billion for hospital and medical care in federal facilities, \$4.6 billion for grants and payments for hospital and health care in non-federal facilities (most of this under the Social Security program), and \$233 million in grants under the Hill-Burton hospital construction program. These are all monies raised from the taxpayers, including members of this Federation. To the extent that these programs are soundly conceived and prudently managed, there will not be any complaints. And I say this even in your case with respect to the Hill-Burton program, because this represents only a very minor portion of the \$10 billion federal health bill and because, properly administered, this money should end up only in facilities required to meet a local need. But to the extent that these programs are not soundly conceived, excessive, and imprudently administered, all taxpayers have a right to complain—and especially those directly affected.

At the time the Administration's Medicare bill was passed in 1965, I don't recall a single member of Congress who did not believe that there was a necessary and proper role for government to play in seeing to it that adequate hospital and health care is provided all citizens, especially our older citizens, who needed it and who could not afford to pay for it. The split came over the Administration's philosophy that all citizens over 65, regardless of their financial resources, should be furnished this service at the expense of the taxpayers. This new concept of "social justice" was enacted into law with great haste and inadequate research and study by the Congress, and it will be a long time before the rough spots will be ironed out.

In any program of such immensity, it is imperative that considerable discretion,

within broad guidelines set forth in the law, be placed in the hands of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Regulations are supposedly drawn up and promulgated by the Department to meet in specifics the policies reflected in the law and its legislative history. It was, of course, envisioned that when the Medicare program went into operation there would be an increase in demand for hospital services, and with the taxpayers footing the bill there was a clear intention on the part of Congress that these costs not be excessive. Unfortunately this intention was emphasized—practically to the exclusion of a correlative intention that those who provided the services should receive reasonable reimbursement. Accordingly, the Department drew up its reimbursement formulae under a policy that if errors were to be made, they had better be made on the side of holding down the costs of the program. Nor did it help matters when it soon became evident that costs of the program had been grossly underestimated. Some of us managed to obtain passage of a watered down amendment late in 1966, which served to prevent downright hardship. Last fall we renewed our effort to legislate a reasonable and uncomplicated reimbursement formula permitting use of a "per diem" basis, but these were offset by an Administration amendment requiring hospitals receiving reimbursement to obtain approval of future capital expenditures from state planning agencies. In the case of non-profit hospitals, this was bad enough; but in the case of the proprietaries it was unthinkable. The net result was that both amendments were dropped in conference.

We have, at least, salvaged a promise from the Department that changes in the reimbursement formula will be given major consideration this year after audit reports covering 18 months' experience have been received and analyzed. This does not meet the point that in the meantime hospitals are receiving inadequate reimbursement and are, thereby, absorbing costs which should be born by the government. Nevertheless, those who make this point, including your speaker, are not presently in control of the Administration or the Congress.

I have been advised that these audit reports will probably have been received and analyzed by mid-summer, so that with all hospitals joining in putting on the pressure, we may hope for some remedial action later in the session. With the elections coming on this fall, however, there may well be an early adjournment, so no delay beyond early summer should be permitted in seeking to advance appropriate legislation.

In conclusion, let me repeat what I said about what could be termed the "negative" policy of the Congress towards costs of the Medicare program. I am fully aware of the charges that have been made towards some of the HEW officials who promulgated the regulations. I have heard it said that their attitude was to drive private and non-profit health care facilities out of business so that the government would take them over; that the health care program of Great Britain was the end objective. This could, of course, happen—although the circumstances leading to the British system are not at all similar to those of the United States. It could happen if those elected officials in our government possess a philosophy inimical to the free enterprise system. And we could have nationalization of the railroads, the steel industry, and many other private activities too—even though the wretched results of such a take-over are present in Great Britain for all to see, if they will only look. But to be fair about it, I must say that I believe that most of the HEW people do not have this objective and are simply trying to hold down costs, in line with the emphasis of Congress, until reliable data are available. Wilbur Cohen, Under Secretary of HEW, told me just last week that he believes there is

a role for proprietary hospitals to fill in the Medicare field, and he recognizes that by their very nature as profit-making institutions they will follow the incentive to adopt efficient and economical operating policies.

Under our system of government, we, the people, have the power to preserve and enhance our economic and political institutions—or to forfeit and even destroy them in favor of the very abuses of power from which the founding fathers fled to America. Thomas Jefferson once said that the success of the great American experiment in self-government is not guaranteed by merely the will of the majority. Rather, he said, it must be by the will of the enlightened majority. In our country, with freedom of speech and freedom of the press, despite their abuses, including undue publicity given the troublemakers, draft violators, hippies, flag burners, and other disreputable characters, our people have the best opportunity of any to become informed.

I hope that what I have had to say will make a small contribution toward this end, because it is people like you who can make the difference in our country's future.

STRONGER GUN CONTROLS NEEDED

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the provisions in the recently passed omnibus crime bill (H.R. 5037) on gun controls are a step in the right direction, but they are far from adequate. By limiting the coverage to handguns only and excluding rifles and shotguns, the bill does not provide effective firearms control legislation.

I am introducing a bill today to impose restrictions on rifles and shotguns parallel to those that H.R. 5037 imposes on handguns. These provisions prohibit mail-order purchases, sales to nonresidents and sales to juveniles. Second, the proposed bill includes provisions to control the interstate shipment of ammunition and the sale of ammunition to juveniles, matters omitted altogether in H.R. 5037.

By recognizing the Federal responsibility to control the indiscriminate flow of firearms and ammunition in interstate commerce this bill will give States and local communities the capacity and the incentive to enact and to enforce their own gun control laws.

The tragic death of Senator Robert Kennedy and the general lawlessness which prevails in our Nation today points up the need for strong gun control laws—for long guns as well as handguns. At the same time this legislation is not designed to place an undue restriction on law-abiding citizens with respect to the acquisition, possession, or use of firearms appropriate to the purpose of hunting, trap shooting, personal protection, collecting, or other lawful activities, nor is it intended to discourage or eliminate the private ownership of firearms by law-abiding citizens for lawful purposes. We have had laws requiring registration of automobiles for a number of years, as well as requirements for li-

censes for hunting, fishing, and various other activities, without infringing on the rights of Americans. Why should we not have similar requirements for lethal weapons?

I trust that in the near future strong gun control legislation will be enacted which will include the substance of my bill.

FLY OLD GLORY ON FLAG DAY

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert in the RECORD an essay written by a 19-year-old young man from Oxford, Nebr., which was printed in the Oxford Standard on June 13, 1968, entitled "Fly Old Glory on Flag Day."

In these times when patriotism does not seem to burn as fiercely in the breasts of American citizens as in former days, I think it is well to reflect on the contents of this very fine essay:

FLY OLD GLORY ON FLAG DAY, JUNE 14

We, as Americans, especially after the recent assassinations, wonder how long America will remain the "land of the free and the home of the brave." Too many people claim there is nothing they can do. Never has a statement indicated more of a myopia on the part of such citizens. The least we can do is show our backing for our nation.

One obvious method of support is simply to fly the flag that others burn. The pride instilled in citizens that see every street lined with flags far outshines the contempt for those who demonstrate in such disgraceful ways.

Unfortunately Oxford, with many other cities, still has quite a ways to go. On Memorial Day Oxfordites flew only 60 flags. Although this is ten better than the number flying on the 4th of July last year, it is still a very poor showing for several reasons. First of all, on the 4th of July it rained part of the day, and even then many people reported they would have flown a flag if they could only have purchased one. The Class of 1970 was informed of this problem and undertook as a project a door to door sale of flags. They sold seventy-five, which indicates at least that many flags could and should be flying on every holiday. But it is interesting to note that the class reported not a single person in Oxford was un-American enough to refuse to purchase a flag, it was just that 90% of the Oxfordites already owned a flag. If that is so, citizens of Oxford should be flying a flag from every single home. To fly only sixty flags in a town of 1300 with 100% ownership of a flag is only an indication of complete laxness and unconcern. It is hypocritical to honor the dead at Memorial Day services and then return home while your flag stays in the closet.

If nothing else, the business district should be lined with flags on national holidays. They should set a good example instead of the reverse. On Memorial Day only nine flags flew in the entire business district. Two residential streets in Oxford flew more flags than all our businesses. These two streets and the fourteen people on each who had enough pride and ambition to honor their nation, along with thirty-two others, are to be commended. Central Street and Ogden Avenue tied as the most American streets in Oxford. Each street found fourteen symbols of freedom flying. Hats off to a minority with a different kind of demonstration.

On June 14th our nation will commemorate Flag Day, honoring the adoption of the Stars and Stripes by the Continental Congress, June 14, 1777. Let's redeem ourselves on this special day and on the 4th of July at least. Let's see how many flags we can fly in support of our nation. Let those that would burn the very symbol that grants them freedom of dissent know that the majority will demonstrate too, but in a different and more meaningful way the disgust with their actions. Let's make those who fly a flag be the majority in Oxford rather than the dissenters. Let everyone that wants to be known as a true American fly a flag on June 14th. All eyes will be watching your home, your business. As the late Sen. Robert Kennedy said, "Let us act!"

May God truly bless America—Bruce E. Wimmer.

HOW INJUSTICES SHOULD BE RIGHTED

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, rioting and civil disobedience are subjects that are of interest to all of us today. It is important that we think about these acts in relation to the future of our judicial system.

Several weeks ago in a speech to the graduating class of Southwest Texas State College, Mr. Leon Jaworski, discussed this problem. These remarks are particularly appropriate since they come from a member of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, the chairman of the American Bar Association's Committee on Crime Prevention and Control, the permanent U.S. member to the World Court of Arbitration at the Hague, a member of the Judge Advocate General's staff during the War Crimes Trials at Nuremberg and a special assistant U.S. Attorney General from 1962-65.

At this time I would like to share excerpts from Mr. Jaworski's speech with the Members of the House of Representatives:

HOW INJUSTICES SHOULD BE RIGHTED

(Houston attorney Leon Jaworski, a member of the President's Crime Commission, spoke last week to the graduating class of Southwest Texas State College about the need for law and order. Following are excerpts from his talk.)

(By Leon Jaworski)

The new order, espoused by some groups and termed "civil disobedience" and the old order, which mean respect for law, are incongruous. They cannot co-exist.

If civil disobedience, as it has been practiced today, is to be commonly accepted, the rule of law will disappear to be replaced by law of individual choice. As Americans, which are we to choose and which are we to defend?

I am not unmindful of the need that exists to correct conditions that may be the roots of crime. But we know that the streets and the highways and the campuses and the beaches are not the place for recourse and that under our constitutional form of government, recourse must be sought in the legislative halls and by due process of law.

Permit me to take you a step further. Whatever be the movement of groups of our citizens that feel maltreated, their acts and conduct must be consistent with the funda-

mental principles that undergird our democratic form of government.

No matter how justified these motivations may be to correct existing evils, they must be conducted within the framework of the laws that govern society. Illegal procedures can have no lasting helpful effect. Let me illustrate.

JUDICIAL SYSTEM CHALLENGED

Every time a court order is disobeyed—each time an injunction is violated—each occasion on which a court decision is flouted, the effectiveness of our judicial system is challenged. How many challenges can it tolerate?

It takes no prophet to know that the judicial institution cannot face wholesale violations of its orders and still retain its efficacy. Has it ever occurred to these disciples of civil disobedience that once they weaken the judicial system, the very ends they seek to attain cannot then be protected or preserved?

Has it ever dawned on the civil disobedier that he may gain his end temporarily but if the power of the judicial institution is decimated in the process, he has gained nothing permanently. He has won the battle but lost the war.

This is so because the antagonist of the civil disobedier's attained objectives may decide to violate them, and if there no longer is a court with authority and power to enforce the rights that have been gained, the victory is an empty one. Thus his undertaking, no matter how conscientious, was self-defeating.

Our judicial system is not without its weaknesses, but it still stands head and shoulders above any other in the world. Its procedures and functions have been improved from time to time to keep pace with society's progress, and more reforms and improvements will need to be accomplished. But its foundation—that the rule of law must prevail—must not be weakened lest we find ourselves drifting toward chaos.

ATTITUDE SPAWNS ILLS

This nation's present attitude toward law and order has brought us great ills. The crime rate is increasing every year. Fifty percent of the major crimes is committed by young people, 17 years of age or under.

Let it not be forgotten that young people emulate older people, and when they witness their elders—some of them in high official places—shout their defiance of court orders and laws, they, too, adopt a disrespectful attitude toward what we used to refer to as the supremacy of the law.

Our attitude as a nation must change—it must revert to an absolute and unyielding regard for an obedience of our laws.

Recently I read some comments that appear to treat rioting as an accepted means of registering grievances and seeking redress. I think that one of the great deficiencies of such comments lies in the failure to stress the fundamental principle that all riots are unlawful and that every participant is a law violator.

One can be in complete sympathy with the need for correcting some of the conditions that exist in poverty-stricken areas but the violence of rioting and its concomitants of looting and malicious burning must never be treated as a substitute for the taking of lawful steps to correct grievances.

In discussing and considering riots, we must begin with the premise that rioting is a crime—that it is lawless conduct.

If every group of individuals who feel that they have a grievance against society should resort to riots to correct these grievances, we might as well abolish our legislative halls, our courts and our municipal offices. As was said by the President's Crime Commission, "No society can afford to tolerate violent and dangerous mass crime."

SAD SPECTACLE IN CAPITAL

The sad spectacle that occurred in Washington in recent weeks requires reassessment. A riot was in progress and for hours par-

ticipants were busying themselves in entering stores, picking up various items, carrying them to their cars and blatantly and defiantly hauling off this merchandise.

This has happened at other places, as well, but to me it seems especially shocking to see this wholesale looting in our nation's capital.

Are we endorsing a standard of conduct that approves the obtaining of goods and merchandise we covet, but do not wish to pay for, by the medium of joining in a riot?

Are we thereby—by becoming rioters—obtaining a license to steal all that we can haul away? This is a new way of committing a crime and obtaining immunity from prosecution.

But I can find no better authority on the subject of rioting than Judge Robert B. Watts of the Municipal Court of Baltimore—a prominent Negro jurist—who pointed to the inescapable conclusion that "Rioting and lawlessness cannot achieve lasting correction in the injustices from which minority groups suffer." Then he added, "The most effective and permanent solutions to our problems are to be found within the political and legal framework of our government, as we work together in partnership with concerned citizens of all races and creeds."

H.R. 17980, A BILL TO REQUIRE THE PAYMENT OF INTEREST ON TAXES WITHHELD FROM WAGES OR PAID AS ESTIMATED TAXES

HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that interest shall be paid on amounts withheld from wages for purposes of the Federal income tax and on certain amounts paid by individuals as estimated income tax.

Our present withholding tax system is derived from the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943. This legislation was enacted to expedite the collection of revenues needed for the war effort as well as to place taxpayers generally on a pay-as-you-go basis. Prior to the enactment of this legislation, the taxpayer paid taxes incurred in the previous year out of his current income.

The withholding system is supplemented by declarations and quarterly payments of estimated tax. In general, these are only required when the full tax liability is expected to exceed withheld tax by more than \$40.

For the majority of the taxpayers who derive their income from wages and salaries, withholding is adequate to meet their tax liability. However, in the case of farmers, professional people, landlords, merchants and others who are not subject to withholding, taxes must be paid on an estimated basis. These individuals, even if they pay the exact amount of their accrued tax liability, have the use of their income for several additional months as compared to the wage earner, because they make their payments at the end of the quarter in which they earned the income. Moreover, generally they can underpay their tax up to 20 percent—33½ percent in the case of farmers and fishermen—and

incur no penalty. Only if the taxpayer underpays his tax by more than a specific amount is he subject to interest payments. In some instances he can even underpay by more than 20 percent depending on his previous year's tax liability and escape an interest penalty.

Thus, not only is the individual who is exempt from withholding able to use his gross income longer than the wage earner, he can often underpay his current tax liability without penalty. Although these underpayments would be relatively small in the case of the family-type farmer or middle-income professional man, for the operator of the large mechanized farm or the high-fee lawyer or public relations man, thousands of dollars could be involved. Of course these taxes must eventually be paid. But in the meantime, the taxpayer has the use of these funds for short-term investment. This compounds the injustice to the average wage earner.

I do not think it is fair to deprive a responsible taxpayer who would be more than willing to meet his tax requirements on the date his taxes are due of the interest he would have earned if he had been able to invest and earn interest on the money withheld.

The Government has recognized to a small degree the unfairness of retaining a taxpayer's money when a refund is due on his income tax. Under current provisions of the Internal Revenue Code interest is allowed on refunds from the date of overpayment to no more than 30 days before the date of the refund check except that no interest is allowed on a refund made within 45 days after the date the tax was due or 45 days from the date of filing, whichever is later. The rate of interest paid on overpayments is 6 percent.

My proposed legislation would extend this reasoning to include the payment of interest after the close of the taxpayer's taxable year at a rate of 3 percent on amounts withheld from wages or paid as estimated taxes. The administrative costs of this procedure should be negligible, merely requiring adjustments in the machine processes currently employed. My bill provides what I consider to be the simplest method for paying this interest—a credit against the taxes to be paid. However, if desired, alternatives could be provided as they are currently for tax refunds.

Mr. Speaker, to me the payment of no interest at all while having the use of someone else's money is usury in reverse. Not only does the Government benefit unjustly from the interest-free use of that part of the taxpayer's income withheld for payment of his tax liability, it overwithholds billions of dollars each year on which it pays no interest. The number of taxpayers subjected to overwithholding and the amount of overwithholding increase each year. Even though the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 was partially designed to reduce the amount of overwithholding, the Internal Revenue Service reported that in fiscal year 1967 the number of returns subjected to overwithholding and the amount of overwithholding exceeded the 1966 levels. In fiscal year 1967 refunds amounted to nearly \$8 billion for nearly

48 million taxpayers. The Government was required to pay less than \$30 million interest to taxpayers who were not refunded their overpayments within the time stipulated by the law. This is indeed little compensation for the use of money which rightfully belonged to the taxpayers, who could have earned substantially higher interest income if they had been able to invest these funds on interest yielding investments.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to take steps to eliminate this inequity from our tax structure. I urge my colleagues to join with me in working for hearings and prompt passage of this legislation.

THE QUESTION OF QUOTAS

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, events of recent months have given rise to a growing concern over an apparent return to identification of persons by race under the concept that such identification helps to preserve racial "identity."

There was a day when such identification was viewed as a symptom of racism, and for this reason, racial identification was eliminated from job application forms, hospital records, and the like. Now, it appears, some who once opposed racial identification are advocating a return to the practice.

Prof. Daniel P. Moynihan recently addressed himself to this subject in a commencement speech at the New School for Social Research. I offer Professor Moynihan's speech, entitled "On the Question of Quotas," at this point in the RECORD:

ON THE QUESTION OF QUOTAS

(Commencement address by Prof. Daniel P. Moynihan at the New School for Social Research, June 4, 1968)

There is to be encountered in one of the Disraeli novels a character described as "a man distinguished for ignorance, as he had but one idea, and that was wrong." I fear that much the same judgment would have to be made of a commencement orator at a typical undergraduate institution who supposes that the graduating seniors had assembled in the quest of enlightenment, as against deliverance. This, happily, is not the case with commencement at The New School, in that for so many of your scholars the occasion neither ends nor begins anything, but is rather, a point in a journey long since begun, and not ever, entirely, to be finished save as life itself comes to a close. Which emboldens me to forsake the local enthusiasms and moral generalizations which characterize this last lecture and speak to a subject of Social Research.

One of the more conspicuous, but somehow least commented upon developments of recent years—one could almost say months, such has been the pace of change—has been the marked reversal in opinion in what are generally seen as liberal circles on the subject of decentralized government and racial quotas. For a good half century now—longer than that, in truth—liberal opinion has held quite strong views on these issues, and they are almost wholly negative. Nor have these views been in any sense marginal. Quite near to the core of the liberal agenda in the period

that continued almost to this moment we find two propositions:

The first is that local government is conservative or even reactionary. Such nostalgia as might have persisted about New England town meetings was seen to be historically obsolete and ethnically inapplicable. Local government here in New York, for example, was known to be run by Irishmen, who were bosses wielding vast but illegitimate power, placing unqualified men on public payrolls, consorting with criminals, and lowering the standards of public life. In the south, local government was in the hands of racists, who systematically excluded Negroes from participation in public affairs, and much else as well. One gathers, it was assumed, that inasmuch as so little was heard from those local governments elsewhere that it was in the hands of dim men, whom no one knew. Hence the great thrust of liberal/intellectual political effort, and central to liberal/intellectual political opinion, was the effort to raise the level at which governmental decisions were made above that of state and local government, to that of the Federal government.

The great and confirming successes of that effort were, of course, the administrations of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt. "States Rights" became a symbol of reaction. Distinguished public servants such as Paul Appleby developed the doctrine that those who insisted that this or that governmental activity was best carried out at the local level, were in fact opposed to such activity, and confident that in actuality, the local government would do nothing. E. E. Schattschneider explained the whole thrust of liberal politics in terms of the effort to raise the level at which decisions were made. And these views had consequences.

Not three years ago, for example, when it appeared that the Johnson administration was about to come forth with a proposal for revenue-sharing with State governments—the well-known Heller-Pechman plan—the proposal was vetoed by the labor movement on grounds that giving more resources to local powers could only strengthen the forces of conservatism and reaction.

The second general theme of which I spoke had to do with the whole issue of ethnic, racial (if one wishes to make a distinction between those two), and religious heterogeneity. These were matters which liberal opinion firmly held ought not to be subjects of public moment or acknowledgement. Rather like politics and women are proscribed as matters of conversation in a Naval officers' mess, it was accepted that such categories existed, and given the doctrine of freedom of conscience, accepted that religious diversity would persist, but in general, opinion looked forward to a time when such distinctions would make as little difference as possible, and certainly aspired to the complete disappearance of ethnic distinctions, which were felt to have little if any validity.

Further, the identification of persons by race was seen as nothing more or less than a manifestation of racism. Andrew Greeley has recently speculated that the historians of, say, the 23rd or 24th century looking back to this time will find, apart from the great population increase in the world, and its westernization and industrialization, that quite the most extraordinary event was the fusing of cultures in the American republic.

The historians of the future will find it hard to believe that it could have happened that English, Scotch, and Welsh, Irish, Germans, Italians, and Poles, Africans, Indians, both Eastern and Western, Frenchmen, Spaniards, Finns, Swedes, Lebanese, Danes, Armenians, Croatians, Slovenians, Greeks, and Luxembourgers, Chinese, Japanese, Philipinos, and Puerto Ricans would come together to form a nation that not only would survive, but, all things considered, survive reasonably well.

I further suggest that the historians of the future will be astonished that American

sociologists, the product of this gathering in of the nations, could stand in the midst of such an astonishing social phenomenon and take it so for granted that they would not bother to study it.

I quite agree with this, largely as I feel that future historians, relieved of our 19th century preoccupation with the appearance of industrialization and the issue of who would control the artifacts thereof, a preoccupation in other words, with issues such as capitalism, socialism, and democracy, will also see that the turbulence of these times has had far more to do with ethnic, racial, and religious affiliation than with these other issues. I spoke at an occasion such as this a year ago at Wheaton College and entitled my remarks "The Age of Ethnicity" arguing, perhaps a bit too confidently:

"Time and again over the past quarter century, when states have been brought to the brink of war or beyond, conflict has turned on the emerging demands and enduring hatreds of peoples, defining themselves in terms of race, ethnicity and religion, giving expression to subtle, powerful and persisting drives, often so clearly contrary to 'rational' self interest as to make the idea of Economic Man assume the quality of a myth not greatly different in murkiness and intent from the notion that the Emperor Jones could only be dispatched with a silver bullet."

Greeley cites the judgment of a colleague that the senior sociologists of our time have, in truth, "repressed the possibility of ethnic research from their consciousness because of their own profound ambivalence about their personal ethnic background." I can well imagine this to be so—certainly when Glazer and I entered the field, arguing the durability, and by inference, the legitimacy of these allegiances—the reception in many quarters was hardly cordial. I am sure your own Horace Kallen has had a not dissimilar experience. But I would argue that much of this academic discomfort reflected the widespread opinion in secular circles that these are matters one does not talk about.

Beginning with the New Deal, Federal legislation began prohibiting discrimination based on race and religion, and this movement increasingly took the form of forbidding acknowledgment even of the existence of such categories. In New York, for example, a prospective employer simply may not ask to know the religious or ethnic affiliation of an employee. A dean of admissions, as I understand it, may not ask for a photograph of an applicant. The culmination of this movement, and to my mind given its insistence on absolute equality in competition, the highwater mark of Social Darwinism in the United States was, of course, the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Now, of a sudden, all this has changed. The demand for decentralization of government, and local participation in decision making about even the most global issues, has become almost a leading issue with liberal thinkers and politicians. Distrust of Washington, once the sure giveaway of a conservative or reactionary mind, has become a characteristic stance of forward looking young men.

And now, ethnic quotas have reappeared, although primarily in terms of racial quotas. That which was specifically forbidden by the Civil Rights Act is now explicitly (albeit covertly) required by the Federal government. Employers are given quotas of the black employees they will hire, records of minority-group employment are diligently maintained, and census repeatedly taken. In universities, in particular, the cry has arisen for racial quotas, roughly representative of population proportions, in both faculties and student bodies, and the proposal is most ardently supported by those who would have themselves considered most advanced in their social thinking.

It would seem to me altogether to be expected that this process will continue and

come to be applied to all the most visible institutions of the land, starting, of course, with those that are most sympathetic to social change, and therefore, most vulnerable to such pressures, and gradually grown more legitimate, extended to the more resistant centers.

What on earth happened? Taking these developments in the order that I listed them, one can perceive at least two sources of the thrust toward decentralization, both of which, can, I feel, properly be described as the result of a learning process, and on that ground to be welcomed. The first is the discovery by liberal middle class America that many of the institutions of working class politics served important and legitimate purposes, and that once destroyed, a vacuum was created that required that the energetic elements of the society—the liberal middle classes—move in.

Having destroyed the power of the local bosses, we learn that the people feel powerless. Having put an end to patronage, and established merit systems in civil service, we find the poor and unqualified are without jobs. Having banished felons from public employment, we find enormous numbers of men who need jobs have criminal records. Having cleaned up the police force, we find that crime is run by the Mafia (or whatever is the current term for slandering Italians), instead of the cops, as was the case in the idyllic days of Lincoln Steffens's youth.

Hence, a return to local organization, and enthusiasm ever so slightly tinged (to no very great harm, I shouldn't think), with the elitism of the middle class liberal/radical who now, as always, is confident that he is capable of running anything better than anyone else, even to running a slum neighborhood. After all, a good deal of neighborhood organization is, in fact, little more than the old middle class thing of trying to obtain political power by indirect means. Thus, to my knowledge, there is hardly a single significant elected or appointed political, judicial, or administrative office in Harlem that is not held by a Negro. But middle class radicals continue to insist the people there are powerless, not the least, one fears, because the one type who is never elected is the middle class radical.

On a different level, I believe it is also clear that the movement towards decentralization has arisen largely from the emergence of what James Q. Wilson has called the bureaucracy problem, the fact, that "There are inherent limits to what can be accomplished by large, hierarchical organizations." Although Max Weber explained to us why large bureaucracies, once established, would work for themselves rather than the putative objects of their concern, it was not until the bureaucracies were established, and women tried to do something with them, that any great number of persons came to see the point.

Interestingly enough, this seems to have happened in the Soviet Union at about the same time as in the United States. For certain, it is an endemic mood among men who went to Washington with John F. Kennedy. It is not just a matter of the dynamics of large organizations, but also of the ambitiousness of our societies. As Wilson continues, "The supply of able, experienced executives is not increasing nearly as fast as the number of problems being addressed."

I wish I could say that thinking has got any further than this, but I don't see that it has, at least in any generalized, political way. We start with the idea that you can't run everything from Washington, and that leads us one step to the notion that you will have to run things locally. But this of course, is merely liberal, or if you will, Christian optimism. Dan Bell keeps reminding us of the Talmudic proposition that merely because a problem can be shown to exist, it does not follow that there is a solution.

We have given, for example, almost no

thought to the role of those bureaucracies as such. I, for example, am much impressed with Irving Kristol's contention that the large municipal bureaucracies of the present time are, in fact, the single most important avenue open to Negroes for advancement in an integrated setting, and that school decentralization will put an end to this. As I am presently in a mood of being deeply skeptical of the powers of schooling to bring about social change, I am not at all pleased at the prospect of exchanging a turgid but thoroughly integrated (I am sorry: I believe that) bureaucracy run from Livingston Street for a turbulent if possibly creative set of segregated bureaucracies. I have made, to my cost, the same general point about the Armed Forces as an avenue to advancement in an integrated organization for Negroes, and I now find that militant liberals and radicals seem bent on destroying both systems.

I would hope and expect that before long we will begin transforming some of the present impulses on this subject into serious thought, research, and experiment on the question of how to administer a big democracy.

But it is with the question of quotas that I am most concerned. As I am almost certain to be misunderstood: that appears to be an occupational hazard in this field (and I would seriously suggest that the training of any social scientist in years to come should include something equivalent to the processes by which psychiatrists are taught to anticipate and accept hostility), let me offer a word or two by way of credentials.

I believe it fair to say that I have been one of a smallish band of sociologists and political scientists who have insisted that race, ethnicity, and religion were and are relevant and functional categories in American life. I accept fully, as does Greeley, the Weberian analysis of E. K. Francis that the ethnic collectivity represents an attempt on the part of man to keep alive during their pilgrimage from *gemeinschaft* to *gesellschaft*, or as Greeley puts it, "from peasant commune to industrial metropolis" some of the diffuse, ascriptive, particularistic modes of behavior that were common to their past. I have argued in favor of the balanced ticket; I have even been a member of one (along with Orin Lehman, your Board of Trustees Chairman). I see the emergence of "black pride" as almost wholly a good thing.

To my ultimate sorrow, I tried to get the welfare establishment in Washington to abandon its so-called "color blind" policy which refused to know anything about the race of welfare recipients on the grounds that this could only give ammunition to racists. My argument there was that it was also giving the rest of the nation a completely mistaken impression that things were getting better for everyone, regardless of "race, creed, or color." (Note in that old phrase, that race obviously referred to what is now known as ethnicity.)

I failed in this effort, but the times are with me, and with Mayor Lindsay announcing that in the fiscal year that begins next month there will be on average more than a million persons receiving welfare here in New York City—a number almost doubled in four years of unprecedented prosperity—I incline to think I was not wrong in trying. But, at the same time, I would hope as we rush towards an ethnic, racial, and religious consociate society, we try to keep our thinking just a bit ahead of events.

My concerns are two-fold and come to this. First, I am worried that having so far been unable to assemble the political majority that would enable the nation to provide a free and equal place for the Negro in the larger society by what are essentially market strategies: full employment, income supplementation, housing construction, and such like, that we will be driven to institutional strategies involving government dictated outcomes

directed against those institutions most vulnerable to government pressure.

I don't like this mostly because I don't like that kind of government pressure. But also because I fear the kind of rigidities that it can build into a society that obviously is most effective when it is most flexible. I quite accept that now and for many years to come there is likely to be a great variety of informal arrangements whereby these matters are taken account of. Surely this is something the Bureau of the Budget should stay out of as much as possible.

My second concern is, to my mind, the greater. Once this process gets legitimated, there is no stopping it, and without intending anything of the sort, I fear it will be contributing significantly to the already well-developed tendency to politicize more and more aspects of modern life. Thirty years ago Orwell wrote, "In our age there is no such thing as 'keeping out of politics.' All issues are political issues . . ." I resist that. Not all issues. Not yet. Note that he added ". . . and politics itself is a mass of lies, evasions, folly, hatred, and schizophrenia." Not all American politics. Not yet. But enough is, and we must therefore struggle against the effort of government, in some large general interest, to dictate more and more of the small details. It is necessary to be more alert to Robert A. Nisbet's observation that democracy is, fundamentally, a "theory and structure of political power," but that liberalism is "historically a theory of immunity from power."

This, to my mind, is something more than a generalized concern. For centuries—obviously it derives from feudal systems of land tenure—it has been obvious that property is not always evenly distributed, and it has been more or less legitimate to talk about it. In America, however, in the modern world, generally, there have grown up new forms of property and influence, not so readily perceived, and the people who possess them have been wisely content to leave it at that. Success, as Norman Podhoretz wrote, and as he learned, is a dirty little secret in America, which those who are successful very much do not like to see discussed in public.

A quality which makes for social stability at this time is that different groups in the population value different kinds of success, and tend to be best at that which they most value. But government knows little of such variegations, and I very much fear that if we begin to become formal about quotas for this or that group, we will very quickly come to realize that these are instantly translated into quotas against. This is painfully true in the field of education and culture, which to a very considerable degree at this particular moment in our history is exceptionally influenced by American Jews. It was in a certain sense an effort to resist the processes that brought about this partial hegemony, that the "older American" institutions imposed quotas in the first place, and it was to abet the process that the quotas were abolished.

Those were in fact quotas on success, imposed against a disproportionately successful group. Let me be blunt. If ethnic quotas are to be imposed on American universities and similarly quasi-public institutions, the Jews will be almost driven out. They are not three percent of the population. This would be a misfortune to them, but a disaster to the nation. And I very much fear that there is a whiff of anti-semitism in many of these demands.

I was interested that when demands for quotas were made at Harvard, the *Crimson* endorsed with some enthusiasm the idea of ethnic representation, if not exactly quotas, on the faculty, but the editors were not at all impressed with the advantages of extending the principle to the student body. I do not know what was on their minds, but I do know that if ethnic quotas ever should come to Harvard (they won't!) something like

seven out of eight Jewish undergraduates would have to leave, and I would imagine it to be a higher proportion in the graduate school.

This, I repeat, would be a misfortune for them, but a disaster for Harvard. And much the same exodus would be required of Japanese and Chinese Americans, especially in the graduate school. America has known enough of anti-semitism, and anti-Oriental feeling to be wary of opening that box again. But I make my point.

At the same time, I hope I would not be interpreted as resisting a more open acknowledgement of three factors. To the contrary, I feel they should be more in our minds, but at a private and informal level of concern. I am acutely aware, for example, of the debilitating imbalance in the ethnic origins of American social scientists. I say debilitating because it is in the nature of heterogeneous societies such as ours that analysis that could in any way be taken as criticism is routinely rejected when the analyst is of a distinctly different group. That is the plain truth of it. And it is a truth much in evidence with respect to Negro studies at this time.

Thirty years ago in this country anyone seeking to learn more about Negroes would have had to read books written by Negroes: Frazier, Drake, Cayton, Johnson, and others. Somehow that tradition, nobly begun by DuBois, faltered. There was not, for example, a single Negro social scientist on the research staff of the President's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. Now, with only a few exceptions, social science studies of Negroes are carried out by whites, and we are not to wonder that more and more the cry goes out from the slums that they are tired of that white magic and will listen no more. They choose to listen instead to the black voices that are at hand, and we know what so many of them say.

But Negroes are only one case, and not a particularly special one. American social science desperately needs to expand its ethnic, racial, and religious base, just as it has got to expand its interests in those areas. There are surprises for all. One learns, for example, that the largest immigrant ethnic group in the Boston area—three times the Negro population—is French Canadian. One learns, in a fascinating analysis of New York done at the Columbia School of Public Health and Administrative Medicine, that the proportion of Negroes with professional or technical occupations in the City is distinctly higher than the proportion of Irish or Italians in that position. One learns that Puerto Ricans, who are much more a minority than Negroes, feel much less a one. And so it goes: a subject of compelling variety and urgent interest. What the world and nation will do about it is their business. Ours, as social scientists, is to think about it. I have spoken most of all in the hope that we will understand this better, and act accordingly. Let me end these remarks with the words that Glazer and I concluded our own study of the city with:

Religion and race define the next phase in the evolution of the American peoples. But the American nationality is still forming: its processes are mysterious, and the final form, if there is ever to be a final form, is as yet unknown.

THE "PUEBLO": HOW LONG, MR. PRESIDENT?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 149th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

BIBLE TRANSLATION DAY

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am sending forward a House joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the 30th day of September in 1968 as Bible Translation Day.

Why a Bible Translation Day?

Mr. Speaker, such a day would pay tribute to those persons over the centuries who have diligently pursued the challenging and exacting labor of translating the sacred scriptures into the languages of people who have no written records.

Among such dedicated laborers in our day are the 2,025 members of the Wycliffe Bible Translators and the Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Among the objectives of these linguistic scholars are the following:

First. The scientific goal is to facilitate communications for better understanding and to produce and preserve for linguistic science, analyses and records of unwritten languages, including dictionaries, grammars, and taped or written sets of legends of the languages encompassed by the Bible translators' program.

Second. The spiritual and moral goal is to translate parts of the Bible without sectarian bias and thus to establish among the bypassed tribespeople of the world a basis of hope, courage, and trust in God that will help them to face and survive the inevitable and frequently deadly impact of the modern world.

Third. The cultural goal—usually in official cooperation with local government agencies—is to produce and print basic literacy and educational materials, and to assist in introducing tribespeople to elements of social and economic progress such as hygiene, community planning, agriculture, animal husbandry, and light industry. Further, a program of bilingual education has proven an effective bridge to national and cultural integration.

Mr. Speaker, the hundreds of linguists, teachers, and technicians dedicated so unselfishly to this great task need encouragement. Furthermore, many hundreds more like them need to be inspired to offer their services for the tremendous task that lies ahead.

As a means of bringing these goals to the attention of people here in the United States and emphasizing the tremendous advances which are being made among the minority groups in Latin America as well as in Arizona, New Mexico, and Alaska, I propose the designation of the 30th day of September as Bible Translation Day. That date was chosen in memory of the revered linguist, Jerome, who at great cost translated the entire Bible into the vernacular of his day.

In my State of Alaska, the University of Alaska's Institute of Social, Economic, and Government Research has just initiated an intensive program to study and

preserve the Alaskan native customs and languages.

The first project under the new program is aimed at developing teaching materials for the Yupik Eskimo language, spoken by an estimated 14,000 persons in the State.

Principal investigator for the Yupik project will be Oashito Miyaoka, assistant professor of linguistics and foreign language at the university. Professor Miyaoka will be assisted by Irene Reed, who, along with Professor Miyaoka, taught Eskimo classes at the university, and by Patrick Afcan, an Eskimo student who speaks fluent Yupik.

Yupik, or some variation of the language, is spoken in the Yukon-Kuskokwim area and in villages on the Kenai Peninsula, Kodiak, Bristol Bay, Nunivak, and St. Lawrence Island, and the Norton Sound area.

Yupik was given first priority because of the large numbers of people who spoke the language. However, there are also groups which are smaller than Yupik in number such as Kutchin, the native language of more than 1,000 persons in and around Fort Yukon. It is important that these groups also be considered for future projects.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my resolution be referred to the appropriate committee for early consideration.

CHAINSTORES AND UNION BOYCOTT CALIFORNIA GRAPES

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues and the Nation a shocking boycott of California grapes that is going on in New York right now. During recent days I have been swamped with letters and telegrams that describe conduct too flagrant to believe. A typical telegram from a group of grapegrowers tell the story better than I can:

JUNE 5, 1968.

Hon. Bob Mathias,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

On Monday, June 3, 1968, a meeting was held in New York between high-ranking AFL-CIO officials and representatives of almost every major chain store organization operating in New York City. The AFL-CIO officials threaten the chains with pickets, with walkouts of AFL-CIO chain store employees, and with stoppages of deliveries of food to the chains if the chain stores continued to handle California table grapes. This type of coercion and blackmail forced the chain stores to unanimously agree, against their will, not to buy California table grapes for their New York City stores, and, perhaps their stores in other cities commencing on Monday, June 10, 1968. This agreement between the chain stores and New York City AFL-CIO unions is patently illegal, and will unquestionably do irreparable damage to the California grape industry and California agriculture as a whole. We urgently request you to exercise the full power of your office

to prevent this illegal boycott and to protect California agriculture, the grape industry, and the food of the Nation.

Marlin Bros.; Jack Radovich; A. Caratan & Sons; Marko Zaninovich, Inc.; Vincent B. Zaninovich, Inc.; Martin J. Zaninovich; M. Caratan, Inc.; D. M. Steele & Sons; Louis Caric & Sons; John Pagliarulo, Inc.; George A. Lucas & Sons; Pandol & Sons; A. & N. Zaninovich; Dan Tudor & Sons.

Mr. Speaker, the labor unions in New York have brought this pressure on the major chainstores to influence the current labor dispute between the United Farm Workers organizing committee and California grapegrowers. The few hundred farmworkers who belong to the United Farm Workers organizing committee led by Cesar Chavez, have been given such widespread, emotional publicity that unions and chains in the East feel safe to engage in the most blatantly illegal practices.

A grape boycott in New York hurts every grower and farmworker in California and can only result in the loss of markets and jobs. Ultimately, it can only mean higher prices to the consumer. A boycott of California grapes threatens the whole Nation. California grapes today—but tomorrow potatoes, tomatoes, corn, beans, melons, olives, oranges, cotton, and wool from every State in the Nation will be affected by this raw use of economic power by giant unions and corporations.

The current situation in New York shows again that the weakest voices in our economy are the farmer and the consumer. The strength of giant food chains and labor unions is being used to destroy the California grower at the expense of the American consumer. We from California intend to protect our growers, our laborers, and our consumers. I hope that my colleagues will join in this effort, because the problem California faces today can affect the whole Nation all too soon.

THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, this is the time for graduation speeches. The problem is, what is said and who said it are not long remembered by the graduates. They seem to have many other things to think about.

One graduation speech has come to my attention that should be remembered. Mr. T. T. Martin, vice president, industrial development, of the Gulf Mobile & Ohio Railroad Co., in Mobile, Ala., addressed the graduating class of Mobile College and gave them something to take with them always. Delivered in the homespun way that only Tom Martin can accomplish, I believe his words are lasting and will be of interest to all Members.

I include Mr. Martin's address, entitled "The Pursuit of Happiness," in the Record at this point:

THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS

(Baccalaureate address, Mobile College, May 10, 1968, by T. T. Martin)

It lacks three years of a half century since I sat where you now sit and endured the tedium with which tradition surrounds the more or less successful completion of certain prescribed courses of study. We were addressed by a much bigger man than I will ever be, in every way. The great height and even greater girth of Ex-president Howard Taft contained a really great spirit and we were most honored in having him as our speaker; but for the life of me I cannot remember a single thing he said. This is a comfort to me now for I realize that while you would not remember my message even if I were able to be profound, you may remember me kindly, if I can contrive to be brief.

Those times were not much like these times. If a man's coat didn't match his pants, he was not following Esquire—he just couldn't afford a new suit and was making the best of two old ones. On the other hand, then as now, the cost of living and ladies hem lines were rising very rapidly and, then as now, the patriarchs viewed the trend in styles with public horror and private enjoyment.

Having just made the world safe for democracy, we faced our future with high ideals, and what turned out to be great illusions. As time went on, and prosperity turned to depression and the brotherhood of nations into a second world war, we lost the illusions, but we didn't get into trouble until we lost some of our ideals. I understand that your generation may not have too many illusions, but I hope very much that this college has helped you to embrace some great ideals, and that in becoming realistic you have not become cynical. It has been said that a cynic is a man who knows the price of everything and value of nothing.

I do not propose to put my generation on a psychiatric couch and indulge in self analysis for your benefit. It's a dangerous practice. You may recall the story of a man who went in to the psychiatrist to be treated for an inferiority complex. Having extracted his innermost secrets and his money, the psychiatrist told him, "My friend, I have great news for you. You do not have an inferiority complex. The truth is, you are just plain inferior." Let me just make the observation that we were doing pretty good until you came along.

Seriously, I hope that when you receive your diploma you will not take it home and hang it on the wall as a trophy, but that you will consider it a hunting license that entitles you to pursue knowledge and understanding in larger fields than those which you have roamed before. Please note that I have not suggested that you pursue happiness. From the founding of this country, and I suppose before, the pursuit of happiness has been one of our cherished rights. Currently, in epigrams and cartoons and music we seem almost piteously obsessed with trying to define it and to find it.

If you will analyze the definitions being given, I think you will find that most of the happiness that people talk about is what I would term "hog happiness." It is the happiness that comes to us through the physical senses and which is based on material well being. There is nothing wrong with it, for partly we are animals living in a material world and responding to physical stimuli; but we ought not to fool ourselves and we ought to recognize it for just what it is. To illustrate: A pig goes to the trough and fills himself with sour mash, wallows around in a mud hole, and then finds a nice sunny spot, stretches out with a grunt, closes his eyes and if you will scratch him behind the ears, he will respond with a very contented "oink"

"oink." A man goes to his club, takes a drink of sour mash whiskey, gets in a steam bath and then lies on the rubbing table smoking a good cigar while the attendant rubs him down. With his eyes closed, in contentment he is likely to draw a sigh of repletion and say, "Oh, boy." It is the same happiness, triggered by the same satisfaction of the same senses. Let me clarify again the fact that there is nothing wrong with this except that if you build your whole life on this kind of happiness you are terribly susceptible to its total loss, if anything happens to the material supports which sustain it.

I submit to you that real happiness is the feeling that I am where I ought to be and doing what I ought to do in relation to time and space and God. This is the search, whether you realize it or not, that you are about to undertake, and the degree of your real happiness is going to be determined by the extent to which you can attain this balance. Perhaps I should have said by the number of times, because few of us are fortunate enough to be able to feel that we are always in the right place at the right time and in the will of God. I think when we are, we will find that at that particular time we are engaged in a service to our fellowmen—whether that service is recognized or not, and whether it is high or whether it is low.

It seems to me that here and now we are truly happy. We are here in this wonderful country, this most liveable community, this beautiful campus, all of which are the end result of centuries upon centuries of men's dreaming, venturing, laboring, and sacrificing on this earth. If also we are in the family of God, adopted by his matchless and unmerited grace through our faith in the redemptive work of our Saviour, we are surely blessed beyond our deserving.

I know that these are perplexing and distressing times, and I have no great solutions to offer. I would like to suggest two very simple things which I think will help you adjust yourselves to life in this quite complex society. It has become fashionable to speak loud and long about the rights of man—the right to freedom of speech, to freedom of conscience, the right to go and come unharassed, civil rights and rights without end; yet I believe we have overlooked two basic rights which, if recognized, would take away much of the bitterness in the world today. I suggest first that you practice recognizing the other person's right to be wrong. Please note I do not say his right to do wrong; but his right just to be wrong. We have such a passion for conformity that we cannot let another person's beliefs differ from our own without trying to force conversion upon him. We try to impose democracy on every nation which is unfortunate enough to become in any way dependent upon us and we try to impose our political and social views on our friends until sometimes they become our enemies. If we can only let the other fellow be wrong once in a while, it will save us a good deal of useless irritation.

Then, of course, there is the much more difficult right which I recommend you recognize and that is: the other fellow's right to be right. Incredible as it may seem, you and I occasionally are wrong and in those rare instances, it would be real helpful if we have already accorded the other fellow the right to be right.

I offer these rather simple suggestions with the hope you will find them useful along with the tremendous array of tools which have been provided you. Whatever the faults of generations past, and however badly the machinery of civilization may seem to have broken down, no generation has ever been given such an array of tools with which to undertake reconstruction and repair. There is nothing particularly new about your task. Eight hundred years ago Omar Khayyam was saying for his generation:

"Ah, love, could only thou and I conspire
To grasp this sorry scheme of things entire,
Would we not shatter it to bits and then
Remold it closer to our heart's desire."

It was a simple world then and it is an infinitely complex world now; but I think the problems are the same, for the problem was and always has been people.

You can comprehend even more fully than I that we are in the midst of a tremendous explosion of knowledge. In a fourth of a lifetime, there has come more expansion of scientific knowledge than in the thousands of years preceding. It is estimated that 90 percent of all the scientists the world has ever developed are now living. As far as the physical well being is concerned, this country has never had it so good; yet, with the highest known standard of living, we seem to be settling for the lowest standards for living. There is every evidence that uncertainty sometimes almost bordering on despair pervades our thinking, for we seem to have somehow failed to master our human problems with anything like the skill we have shown in mastering our scientific problems.

In trying to solve our problems of human relationship, I think we may be making the mistake of trying to paint with our small individual brushes on too large a canvas, of being overly concerned with what others ought to do, instead of being concerned with what we, ourselves, can do.

Communication and transportation have shrunk this world so that we are closer in time to people on the other side of the globe than our fathers were to the people in the next county; and news of disaster and suffering in foreign lands reaches us more quickly than the news of a tragedy reached our fathers from 5 miles away. Because of this, we have become involved with people all over this globe and many of our well meaning leaders wish us to become even more involved. We have been made aware of the poverty, famine and disease ridden peoples of the world, and we have apparently developed a sense of shame or guilt that we do not share so fully in their lot. Much of this is good, but some of it is dangerously maudlin thinking. We owe no one an apology for having inherited this land, its riches and its opportunities from forefathers who were willing to endure hardships, privation and dangers while they carved out of wilderness the farms and cities of today. We need not apologize unless we have taken all the benefits of their work and have not contributed of ourselves to make this a better and stronger country for our children and their children.

It is this commitment to the future which separates the man of faith from the man of futility.

I like the story of the retired British Admiral in those days when England ruled the seas with men of iron in ships of oak. He had given a full lifetime in Her Majesty's service and lost a leg in her defense. People noticed that one pleasant afternoon, while he was driving about the countryside he would stop his carriage, get out and hobble to the edge of the road where he would jab a hole with his wooden peg, and seem to lean over and look into it. Someone asked him what he was doing. "Sir" he said "I am doing all I am able to do now—I am planting acorns that Her Majesty may not lack for oak with which to build her ships."

It is important to be sensitive to the needs of our fellowmen all over the world; but it is also important as a nation to be realistic. It is all right, it is even admirable under some circumstances, for an individual to sacrifice everything he owns to alleviate the suffering of his fellows—although if he sacrifices the means by which he could produce more year after year, he may be doing ques-

tionable good. A community, a state or nation, cannot, however, justify self-liquidation. In a world where the principles of self-determination, self-responsibility, self-respect and respect for every individual are upheld by far too few communities of free men, it is important that these islands of material and spiritual security be not submerged in seas of time-serving sentiment. It seems to me that we are often like a Coast Guard crew who have gone out on a stormy sea to rescue the victims of a shipwreck, and who, having picked up all their lifeboat may safely hold, simply will not pull to safety and return for another load but keep tearing planks out of the lifeboat to throw to the desperate people still in the water.

It is easy to be concerned with Suez and Siam; but it is important to be concerned with my community, my state and my country. If we meet here the needs of our truly unfortunate; if we provide an opportunity to learn and to earn to all who will use it; if we foster in our children the inquiring mind, the venturing spirit, and the spiritual strength to know and to do what is right rather than what is expedient; if we apply the processes of law equally and fearlessly to all people regardless of class; we shall have made a community, a county, a state and a nation stronger. It may not be as glamorous to work for better schools, better sanitation, better recreation, better churches, better stores and factories, and better relations between the people of our community—but it is the thing that you and I can do and the thing no one else can or should do for us. It was this process which built our country—not the patriarchal direction of big or little government.

Let me add this personal observation. I take it that none of us, wherever his lot may fall, wishes his life to be without significance. Yet someone has well said, "If you want to know how much you will be missed fifty years after you are gone, stick your finger in a bucket of water, pull it out and look for the hole." That sounds cynical, but it is so, and it is just as well, for each generation has enough to do to carry the present into the future without being unduly encumbered with memories of the past. Immortality, however, does not depend on the memories of men. You and I, as believers in Christ, have begun our eternal life, and in the brief seconds of eternity devoted to our mortal span, we have been given our area and our time in which to make our contribution. That contribution is judged in the light of our abilities and our opportunities by One who knows us better than our friends, our families, or we ourselves can know.

I say to you with the most earnest conviction that should you amass more wealth than any man has held before, should you be given the highest office and the most cherished honors your fellow citizens can confer, should all men call you great and many call you good, the time will surely come when these will be but dust and ashes blown about by the winds of time, unless our Lord shall say, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

And what of happiness? In these not too well connected words, I have been trying to give you some of the characteristics of the fortunate people whom I have known who have been truly happy in the highest and best definition of happiness—that of being and doing what they ought to be and do, in their time, in their place and before their God. The interesting thing to me is that not one of these people ever gave a moment's thought to the pursuit of happiness. Happiness simply overtook them while they were in pursuit of higher things. May it be so with you.

BITTER FRUIT

HON. ROBERT McCLOREY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. McCLOREY. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing attitude among many that in order for our Nation to progress it must first be destroyed. Instead of a willingness to build on the existing solid foundation for progress, these rebellious persons would destroy our Nation in the belief that rebuilding from the rubble would result in a better nation.

Such dangerous and mistaken beliefs are described and rejected in the potent editorial which appeared in the June 8 issue of the Weekly News Letter of the Illinois State AFL-CIO. The author of the editorial, Mr. Stanley L. Johnson, is vice president of the Illinois State Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations and one of the editors of this significant publication of organized labor.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this editorial entitled "Bitter Fruit" to the thoughtful attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives and more particularly to the citizens of the Nation—young and old, black and white—who are plagued with the threats of disorder and destruction as well as the frustrations and challenges prevalent in today's society.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my friend, Mr. Stanley L. Johnson, and his labor organization for their public service and for the responsible and timely message of enlightenment which this editorial conveys:

BITTER FRUIT

Thoughts, Words, Actions and Deeds. Never were the foregoing sequences more applicable than to our times.

The internal frustrations, hatreds, prejudices have erupted in words of obscenity, hate-filled statements and seditious utterances abusing the right of free speech. Actions of assassination, rioting, looting, assaults, killing ad nauseam. The end result of death, destruction, crumbling or moral and ethical values has had both a numbing effect and worse, the brush-off of individual responsibility.

Generation against generation, white against black, black against white, poor against the rich, rich against the poor, youth against itself with dope and withdrawal, students, even pre-teens, rebelling against school authority and manifestations or symptoms of what? History tends to repeat itself. These are warnings of excesses in the fields of dissent, free speech, free press and assemblage under our constitutional guarantees of freedom and liberty. The tragic result could be the very curtailment of these freedoms which have been so slowly and painfully achieved.

There is the beginning of resentment against excesses which the astute protectors of the status quo will use as a shield against correcting injustice in the land. The yearnings of the vast majority for peace in the world and law and order at home could lull them into accepting curtailment of the freedoms which have been unhappily misused too often in the last few years.

Individual restoration of faith in our society, respect for each other beginning with parental example and discipline is a beginning. Respect for our government, which has to show through its elected representatives that equality before the law is not just a slogan—it is a must. That respect, born of a belief that our type of government has and can meet the economic challenges, the international challenges, and above all the internal ethical challenges, will further strengthen the foundation of law and order.

Let us individually, collectively and with our government composed of humans, remember that with our rights are also coupled duties and responsibilities.

Let us have an end to this wild irrational jabbering and actions directed to wrecking our society in order to rebuild. Let us have an end to the negative rantings of repression. Instead, the recognition that we can strengthen and enlarge our present society, which has meant so much to us and the world, through constitutional and lawful means, is a reaffirmation of our faith in God and Country.

HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON THE NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 1968—S. 1166

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican Policy Committee supports the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968—S. 1166—as it has been reported by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

This bill provides adequate Federal safety standards for the interstate transportation of gas by pipeline and for pipeline facilities. It would close the safety gap that now exists with respect to this important mode of transportation.

As reported by the committee, S. 1166 contains the following major provisions:

First. The Secretary of Transportation is directed to establish within 24 months minimum safety standards for the gathering, transmission and distribution of gas by pipeline for its storage and for pipeline facilities used in the transportation or treatment of gas.

Second. Each person engaged in the transportation of gas or who owns or operates pipeline facilities has the duty to comply with the safety standards, file and comply with a plan of inspection and maintenance, and permit access to records, make reports and permit entry or inspection.

Third. The Secretary of Transportation will enforce the standards with respect to pipeline facilities and the transportation of gas subject to the Federal Power Commission. Standards for all other pipeline facilities and transportation of gas will be enforced by the Secretary or by a State agency, including a municipality, that is certified for that purpose.

Fourth. A pipeline safety standards committee is established and a judicial review of orders issued by the Secretary is provided.

Today, there are more than 800,000 miles of gas pipeline in the United States. These lines range in diameter from less than 1 inch to 42 inches with 48-inch lines under construction. Many of the transmission lines now traverse densely populated areas and the distribution of much of the gas is handled by mains originally constructed for manufactured gas. This means that these distribution systems have been in existence for many years and that some of the pipe presently in use is from 30 to 40 years old and perhaps much older.

Although 67 people have been killed in gas transmission accidents from 1950 to November 1967, the overall safety record of the transmission industry has been a relatively good one. Many of the recorded deaths were attributable to accidents involving trucks or other instrumentalities beyond the control of the pipeline operators. Moreover, since 1935 there has been in existence, and operating, an industry safety code created and developed by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers and the U.S.A. Standards Institute. Secretary of Transportation Boyd has testified that—

Few industries have devoted the time and attention to safety procedures as has this one.

The safety record for the distribution systems stands in sharp contrast. Although the information regarding past accidents is sketchy at best, there have been major accidents in recent months that have given ample warning of the danger that is present and the need for a step-up in gas distribution safety procedures.

On January 13, 1968, there was a fire that engulfed in Queens, Long Island, an area equivalent to an entire block. In this fire, seven people were injured and 19 families were left homeless. On February 19, 1968, there was an explosion in a rehearsal hall in South Milwaukee, Wis., where 250 people had been located just 20 minutes prior to the explosion. Explosions in Hastings, N.Y., Logansport, Ind., Fort Worth, Tex., and St. Louis, Mo., have killed and injured a number of people and caused a great deal of property damage.

The 63,000 miles of gathering lines located almost entirely in unpopulated areas have presented no safety problems. This bill exempts these lines from coverage until such time as the area through which a line runs becomes nonrural, as determined by the Secretary of Transportation. Then, for the protection of the population which is affected by the presence of such a line, the Federal safety standards will apply.

Due to the rapid growth of the industry and the population which it serves, there is a need for a coordinated safety effort in the field of gas transmission and distribution. This bill provides a sound basis for the introduction and implementation of reasonable safety standards that will protect the public and help to insure the uninterrupted transmission and distribution of a vital com-

modity that is, if improperly handled, inherently dangerous to both life and property.

THE GOVERNMENT'S MANDATORY INVESTMENT CONTROL PROGRAM

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 17, 1968, I had the pleasure of speaking before the St. Paul Area Chamber of Commerce in St. Paul, Minn.

In that speech I outlined the self-defeating nature of this administration's controls on direct private investment abroad. Ultimately these controls will harm our balance of payments. In addition, this type of program is subject to administrative abuse and is in all probability illegal.

The real problem causing our balance of trade problem is the current inflation based on the present and accumulated Federal deficits. This country must put its economic house in order, establish spending priorities, stop inflation and restore equilibrium to our balance of payments.

The speech follows:

CURE THE SYMPTOMS—KILL THE PATRIOT— THE U.S. ECONOMY IN 1968

With the House Ways and Means Committee currently holding hearings on the future of U.S. foreign trade policy, I welcome the opportunity to share with you my views on U.S. trade policy and the economy in general. Two weeks ago we had Administration witnesses before the Ways and Means Committee who urged the passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1968. The Act has finally come to light after an abnormally long gestation period inside the Administration. Last week the first in a long list of public witnesses testified for and against the Trade Expansion Act and for and against the quota bills also pending before the Ways and Means Committee.

I must confess I am disheartened after hearing the first two weeks of testimony. A lot has been said about the balance of trade and the problems U.S. industries are having but nothing has been said about the basic cause of our balance of trade problems—domestic inflation. This inflation stems directly from the Federal deficit of fiscal 1968 and the cumulative deficits over a number of years. The Administration seems unable and unwilling to take the necessary steps to control the Federal deficit. Even now, with the House having clearly expressed its intent to have expenditure reductions of \$6 billion for fiscal 1969, the President refuses to sit down with Congressional leaders to determine exactly where line-item cuts can be made. Instead, the Administration telephones administrators of Federal health and education projects around the country telling them their particular programs will be cut if expenditure reductions are made. The President is exhibiting gross demagoguery when he says that any cuts must come out of the poverty program. This is completely unnecessary. I have listed over \$15 billion of cuts that could be imposed almost immediately without touching health, education, welfare, and poverty programs. But, as the President's silence continues on as to where he would cut, one perhaps wonders whether he really does intend to cut in these areas.

But wherever he really does plan to cut

back, he must begin planning now. Fiscal year 1969 begins in 14 days. It is probably already too late to make cuts for July—the first month of fiscal 1969. And the longer action is delayed, the longer we avoid striking at the inflationary forces ruining our balance of trade. We must get at inflation immediately. Furthermore, 6 months of fiscal 1969 are under a new Administration and there is little to prevent the Johnson Administration from continuing to spend at an uncurtailed level leaving the absorption of the 6 billion dollar expenditure cuts for his successor in office.

The Administration has testified that with the tax increase alone inflation would be over 3% this year. This itself is entirely unacceptable. What we now see happening with imports results from domestic inflation and the trade figures for the first 4 months of the year show a trade surplus of only \$1.290 billion on an annualized basis, off from a figure of \$4.116 billion for 1967.

What action has the Administration taken with regard to the balance of payments? Unfortunately, the Administration has extended direct controls over investment and lending overseas and has sought to extend controls over travel by Americans. Direct controls are self-defeating attempts to save the system because the system gets destroyed in the process. What good have all our efforts been since World War II to construct an open international economy when we insidiously restrict it in the name of its salvation?

Let us look at what the Administration has done in its attempt to correct the balance of payments problems. A look at the record is very instructive in approaching this subject.

Between 1950 and 1966 the United States Government paid out net in military expenditures, grants, loans and for various services \$87.6 billion. During the same period, corporations and private citizens brought into the country \$59.0 billion in excess of all private dollar outflows. In short, during this period the government sector has been continuously in deficit, and the private sector continuously in surplus. But the surplus has not been sufficient to cover the public sector deficit.

The U.S. Government, however, has sought to grapple with the problem not so much by curtailing its own expenditures but by curtailing private sector investments and especially the direct investments of American business in production and marketing facilities abroad.

But direct investments abroad by American business have consistently earned a surplus for the balance of payments—both on direct investment return and for M.S. exports keyed to such investment. Our problems are not due to the private sector, but rather to overcommitment by government abroad. Therefore, we can legitimately question why so little is being done to reduce governmental expenditures abroad. Instead of reductions on government account, the thrust of the government's program has been to look for expenditures to enable the government to keep its current level of expenditures up or even increase them. The government has laid particular stress on two aspects of the private sector—export promotion and the restriction of direct investments abroad.

The Administration is seeking to improve the trade balance by promoting exports but is seeking to improve the capital account by restricting capital outflows. It is argued by the government that, since return on investment is the result of prior investment—in the short run we can cut down current outflows while still preserving the previous rate of inflows thus improving the capital account in the short-run.

But what is the short-run? Testimony before the Joint Economic Committee indicates that U.S. private investment abroad has a

payback period of about 5 years. 5 years have already gone by since the interest equalization tax was imposed to restrict investment, thus our balance of payments is already being affected adversely due to lack of return on investments that were not made.

A recent study just completed by the Institute of Finance of the New York University's Graduate School of Business Administration states that \$4 billion in revenues will be lost over the next 10 years as a result of the government curbs on direct private investment overseas. Although these controls on direct capital investment have been effective in reducing the current balance of payments gap by about \$800 million to \$1 billion the study holds that they will have long-term negative effects.

Moreover, direct investments cannot be separated from exports. They are not alternatives, but complementary. Markets abroad for exports depend on investments. The Commerce Department estimates that 25% of all U.S. exports are directly related to affiliates and subsidiaries of U.S. companies established with prior direct investment. By preventing direct investments we prevent exports. Economically, the continuation of the Mandatory Program on investment restrictions cannot be justified and must be abolished.

There are other things wrong with the mandatory investment program. The decision of where and when and how much to invest no longer becomes a function of the market place but rather a process of administrative discretion. The ability to get waivers or exceptions from the mandatory rules—which in many cases means being able to continue in business—depends upon being able to persuade a government official of the merits of your case. The possibilities for corruption and graft are, of course, great. Government by administration discretion leads to economic distortions and political corruption. Business is made to feel unpatriotic by seeking to survive. This is no proper way to conduct foreign economic policy.

Moreover, the Mandatory Program is illegal. These controls were issued January 1, 1968, based on Section 5(b) of the 1917 Trading With the Enemy Act. This Act can be invoked in two instances: 1) In time of war (we are not constitutionally at war.) 2) "During any other period of national emergency." What is an emergency? Emergency is defined as a sudden, unexpected happening; an unforeseen occurrence or condition. The courts have held that in a constitutional sense, emergency does not mean expediency, convenience, or best interest. The balance of payments condition as of January 1, 1968, can in no way be considered sudden or unexpected. The U.S. balance of payments has been in a deficit condition for 17 of the last 18 years and the government is still not getting at the basic reasons for this imbalance.

The powers of the Trading With the Enemy Act only become operative when the President declares a national emergency. President Johnson did not declare a national emergency to obtain the authority to use the Trading With the Enemy Act but rather fell back on a 1950 Proclamation of a National Emergency made by President Truman at the time of the U.N. Police Action in Korea. President Johnson said that the continued existence of the national emergency of 1950 made necessary his orders. But the Truman Proclamation had nothing to do with balance of payments problems as indeed there were none at the time.

The Administration has not gone to the Congress to obtain the authority to invoke these controls on foreign investment—controls which limit the right of American business to transact its international operations as it sees best. Thus we have government by decree—government by men and not by law.

These can lead to administrative abuses as I have mentioned above.

Instead of attacking the real causes of our domestic deficit and balance of payments deficits which are caused by government overspending—the government has resorted to a series of direct controls which are not only subject to administrative abuse and economically unsound but they are also illegal.

We have to have a change in our economic policy—both domestic and international. Unless we move toward genuine expenditure reform I have no doubt another run on the dollar will occur. The world needs dramatic proof that this country can establish spending priorities, stop inflation and restore equilibrium to our balance of payments. At the same time we must eliminate the direct controls which have nothing—economically or legally—to recommend them. Fortunately there is a national election in about 5 months when the people will have the opportunity to express their views effectively at the ballot box. This is the date that the world as well as the American people are setting their sights on.

LACK OF COMPETITIVENESS IN GOVERNMENT

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed happy to see that the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation has begun to seriously question the lack of competition in awarding some \$40 billion a year in defense contracts. The subcommittee's action, which I have known was coming for some time, delves into a matter which has been a subject of much concern to me for my entire term of service in the Congress—that is, the lack of competitiveness in all Government purchasing.

Mr. Speaker, the General Accounting Office has provided me with detailed figures on Government-wide purchasing, with particular emphasis on the amount of contracts awarded by competitive bidding as compared to the amount awarded by negotiated contracts. The results reported to me, which I am disclosing for the first time today, are a disgrace to the Americans taxpayers. The GAO investigation, Mr. Speaker, shows that out of a total of \$50.6 billion in Federal spending for both military and civilian executive agencies, \$42.9 billion in purchases were made through negotiated contracts.

As the Senate subcommittee has already pointed out, the Defense Department is, by far, the biggest offender as well as the biggest purchaser. This Department awarded 86.6 percent of its purchasing contracts through negotiation, as opposed to open, competitive, advertised, public bidding.

These contracts amounted to \$37.6 billion. The Defense Department lamely attempts to justify this outrage on the taxpayers by contending that the purchases by negotiation come within the exceptions outlined by the Congress in the so-called Truth in Negotiations Act. But, Mr. Speaker, even the most casual examination of the facts will lead one to believe that the exceptions have been

twisted to where they have become the rule.

With all the high-powered talent the Defense Department has had available in recent years, one would at least expect that there would be some improvement, year by year, in the overall percentage of contracts awarded through open competition instead of negotiation. Yet, the facts show that exactly the reverse is true. Whereas the percentage of contracts awarded in open, advertised competition was 17.6 percent in 1965, it dropped to 14.2 percent in 1966 and 13.4 percent last year.

More than 57 percent of the total procurement done by negotiation was excused under four clauses found in the Negotiations Act. The greatest increase in dollar volume and percentage increase comes under the vague heading, "Impractical to secure competition by formal advertising." Purchases using this escape clause rose from \$5.7 billion in 1966 to \$7.5 billion in 1967, with the percentage rising from 15.5 percent to 17.3 percent.

Then, the Department attempts to excuse itself further by contending that where it did not use open, competitive bidding for purchasing, it did solicit two or more sources for competitive price, design or technical proposals. Yet, again the facts refute this argument because 52.5 percent of defense purchasing was by single-source, solicited negotiated contracts. Only 34.1 percent of purchasing was done through multisource, solicited negotiations.

While we acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, that the Defense Department is the greatest offender in noncompetitive purchasing, we should not overlook that civilian agencies are also making a mockery of competitive bidding practices. Among civilian agencies, 73.6 percent is done by negotiated contract, involving \$5.3 billion. Only 26.4 percent, or less than \$2 billion worth, is done through advertised, competitive purchasing.

Mr. Speaker, in a time of conflict in which we are now engaged, we can expect a certain amount of contracts for defense purposes to go to certain contractors because the national interest requires fast and speedy delivery to our troops overseas. But, at no time should we allow this justification to be wrongfully, shamefully used to the extent that more than 86 percent of defense purchasing and more than 73 percent of civilian purchasing is done on a non-competitive basis. "Public exigency" does not require us to close our eyes to practices which are a fraud upon the taxpayers and a sham to get around the laws passed by this body. For the Record, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting with my remarks the full text of the report made for me by the General Accounting Office in the hope that it will cast some light here in the House onto the purchasing practices which the other body is now rightfully investigating, and I include in the Record.

It is my firm conviction that open, competitive, advertised public bidding is the very best protection this Congress can give the American taxpayer for the efficient use of his tax dollars. And this

TABLE 10.—COMPETITION IN MILITARY PROCUREMENT BY AUTHORITY (FISCAL YEARS 1966 AND 1967)—Continued

[Amounts in thousands]

Statutory authority (10 U.S.C. 2304(a))	Total amount (A)		Competitive											
			Total		Price								Design or technical	
					Fiscal year 1966				Fiscal year 1967				Fiscal year 1966	
	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967	Amount	Percent of (A)	Amount	Percent of (A)	Amount	Percent of (A)	Amount	Percent of (A)	Amount	Percent of (A)
(1) National emergency.....	\$1,856,600	\$2,113,651	\$1,836,777	98.9	\$2,104,108	99.5	\$1,830,715	98.6	\$2,096,783	99.2	\$6,062	0.3	\$7,325	0.3
(2) Public exigency.....	5,081,593	6,028,574	2,491,652	49.0	2,305,040	38.2	2,410,744	47.4	2,181,545	36.2	80,908	1.6	123,495	2.0
(3) Purchases not more than \$2,500 ¹	1,704,868	1,841,300	1,704,868	100.0	1,841,300	100.0	1,704,868	100.0	1,841,300	100.0	0	0.	0	0.
(4) Personal or professional.....	92,431	90,549	26,214	28.4	29,881	33.0	7,253	7.9	7,464	8.2	18,961	20.5	22,417	24.8
(5) Services of educational institutions.....	383,649	453,955	14,463	3.8	10,236	2.3	4,880	1.3	2,717	.6	9,583	2.5	7,519	1.7
(6) Purchases outside United States.....	1,934,316	2,263,460	1,374,848	71.1	1,372,678	60.6	746,146	38.6	848,731	37.5	628,702	32.5	523,947	23.1
(7) Medicine or medical supplies.....	126,742	144,514	77,409	61.1	108,220	74.9	77,311	61.0	108,151	74.8	98	.1	69	.1
(8) Supplies purchased for authorized resale.....	230,439	218,741	55,365	24.0	54,471	24.9	54,421	23.6	53,723	24.6	944	.4	748	.3
(9) Perishable or nonperishable subsistence.....	1,088,222	1,178,015	991,292	91.1	1,067,106	90.6	991,292	91.1	1,067,106	90.6	0	0.	0	0.
(10) Impractical to secure competition by formal advertising.....	5,746,988	7,521,549	1,518,920	26.4	2,767,646	36.8	1,309,058	22.8	2,497,940	33.2	209,862	3.6	269,706	3.6
(11) Experimental, developmental, test, or research.....	4,495,669	4,848,162	1,124,610	25.0	1,099,659	22.7	148,315	3.3	109,582	2.3	976,295	21.7	990,077	20.4
(12) Classified purchase.....	122,571	129,148	59,144	48.3	61,737	47.8	57,954	47.3	53,405	41.4	1,190	1.0	8,332	6.4
(13) Technical equipment requiring standardization and interchangeability of parts.....	105,630	132,084	18,428	17.4	35,015	26.5	18,222	17.2	35,015	26.5	206	0.2	0	0.
(14) Technical or specialized supplies requiring substantial initial investment or extended period of preparation for manufacture.....	6,039,207	6,500,576	346,530	5.7	122,779	1.9	295,407	4.9	122,661	1.9	51,123	.8	118	(?)
(15) Negotiation after advertising.....	9,889	2,280	6,023	60.9	828	36.3	6,023	60.9	828	36.3	0	0.	0	0.
(16) Purchases to keep facilities available in the interest of national defense or industrial mobilization.....	2,171,779	3,292,966	1,065,841	49.1	1,177,476	35.7	998,493	46.0	1,150,631	34.9	67,343	3.1	26,845	.8
(17) Otherwise authorized by law.....	754,753	829,557	605,590	80.2	664,002	80.0	594,673	78.8	646,767	78.0	10,917	1.4	17,235	2.0

Statutory authority (10 U.S.C. 2304(a))	Noncompetitive											
	Total				Follow-on				Other 1 source			
	Fiscal year 1966		Fiscal year 1967		Fiscal year 1966		Fiscal year 1967		Fiscal year 1966		Fiscal year 1967	
	Amount	Percent of (A)	Amount	Percent of (A)	Amount	Percent of (A)	Amount	Percent of (A)	Amount	Percent of (A)	Amount	Percent of (A)
Total.....	\$18,627,372	50.0	\$22,766,899	52.5	\$7,448,985	20.0	\$7,844,234	18.1	\$11,178,387	30.0	\$14,922,665	34.4
Intragovernmental.....	0	0.	0	0.	0	0.	0	0.	0	0.	0	0.
Total, except intragovernmental.....	18,627,372	58.3	22,766,899	60.6	7,448,985	23.3	7,844,234	20.9	11,178,387	35.0	14,922,665	39.7
Formally advertised.....	19,823	1.1	9,543	.5	13,258	.7	3,381	.2	6,565	.4	6,162	.3
(1) National emergency.....	2,589,941	51.0	3,723,534	61.8	450,819	8.9	498,055	8.3	2,139,122	42.1	3,225,479	53.5
(2) Public exigency.....	0	0.	0	0.	0	0.	0	0.	0	0.	0	0.
(3) Purchases not more than \$2,500 ¹	66,217	71.6	60,668	67.0	4,026	4.3	1,010	1.1	62,191	67.3	59,658	65.9
(4) Personal or professional services.....	369,186	96.2	443,719	97.7	27,112	7.0	33,735	7.4	342,074	89.2	409,984	90.3
(5) Services of educational institutions.....	559,468	28.9	890,782	39.4	61,889	3.2	226,350	10.0	497,579	25.7	664,432	29.4
(6) Purchases outside the United States.....	49,333	38.9	36,294	25.1	0	0.	20	(?)	49,333	38.9	36,274	25.1
(7) Medicine or medical supplies.....	175,074	76.0	164,270	75.1	0	0.	0	0.	175,074	76.0	164,270	75.1
(8) Supplies purchased for authorized resale.....	96,930	8.9	110,909	9.4	0	0.	0	0.	96,930	8.9	110,909	9.4
(9) Perishable or nonperishable subsistence.....	4,228,068	73.6	4,753,903	63.2	1,010,240	17.6	995,647	13.2	3,217,328	56.0	3,758,256	50.0
(10) Impractical to secure competition by formal advertising.....	3,371,059	75.0	3,748,503	77.3	1,381,130	30.7	1,446,069	29.8	1,989,929	44.3	2,302,434	47.5
(11) Experimental, developmental, test, or research.....	63,427	51.7	67,411	52.2	11,765	9.6	13,066	10.1	51,662	42.1	54,345	42.1
(12) Classified purchases.....	37,202	82.6	97,069	73.5	30,303	28.7	30,790	23.3	56,899	53.9	66,279	50.2
(13) Technical equipment requiring standardization and interchangeability of parts.....	5,692,677	94.3	6,377,797	98.1	4,360,045	72.2	4,500,986	69.2	1,332,632	22.1	1,876,811	28.9
(14) Technical or specialized supplies requiring substantial initial investment or extended period of preparation for manufacture.....	3,866	39.1	1,452	63.7	0	0.0	166	7.3	3,866	39.1	1,286	56.4
(15) Negotiation after advertising.....	1,105,938	50.9	2,115,490	64.3	91,766	4.2	89,433	2.7	1,014,172	46.7	2,026,057	61.6
(16) Purchases to keep facilities available in the interest of national defense or industrial mobilization.....	149,163	19.8	165,555	20.0	6,632	0.9	5,526	0.7	142,531	18.9	160,029	19.3
(17) Otherwise authorized by law.....												

¹ Price competition required on all actions of \$250 or more.² Less than 0.05 percent.

TABLE 13.—AWARDS BY STATUTORY AUTHORITY (JULY TO JUNE)

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Statutory authority (10 U.S.C. 2304(a))	July 1965 to June 1966						July 1966 to June 1967					
	Total		Army	Navy	Air Force	Defense Supply Agency	Total		Army	Navy	Air Force	Defense Supply Agency
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Amount	Amount	Amount	Amount	Percent	Amount	Amount	Amount	Amount
Total.....	\$38,243,107		\$11,298,202	\$10,464,257	\$10,740,754	\$5,739,894	\$44,632,600		\$12,390,578	\$13,998,335	\$12,065,423	\$6,178,264
Intragovernmental.....	1,014,603		158,799	448,909	363,531	43,364	1,251,540		227,387	667,771	315,786	40,596
Total, except intragovernmental.....	37,228,504	100.0	11,139,403	10,015,348	10,377,223	5,696,530	43,381,060	100.0	12,163,191	13,330,564	11,749,637	6,137,668
Formally advertised.....	5,283,158	14.2	1,792,440	1,417,196	455,292	1,618,230	5,791,979	13.4	1,588,342	2,112,261	409,701	1,681,675
Other authority (subtotal).....	31,945,346	85.8	9,346,963	8,598,152	9,921,931	4,078,300	37,589,081	86.6	10,574,849	11,218,303	11,339,936	4,455,993
(1) National emergency (subtotal).....	1,856,600	5.0	484,759	328,946	255,909	786,986	2,113,651	4.9	514,494	375,061	251,232	972,864
(a) Labor surplus area and industry set-asides.....	156,672	0.4	37,375	23,264	7,690	88,343	108,025	.3	4,835	17,109	8,409	77,672
(b) Small business set-asides (subtotal).....	1,594,571	4.3	444,897	304,912	240,938	603,824	1,827,987	4.2	506,969	357,565	239,875	723,578
1. Unilateral.....	1,398,904	3.8	406,559	273,285	142,737	576,323	1,800,371	4.1	496,784	355,860	224,084	723,643
2. Joint.....	195,667	.5	38,338	31,627	98,201	27,501	27,616	.1	10,185	1,705	15,791	—65
(c) Balance-of-payments program.....	105,357	.3	2,487	770	7,281	94,819	177,639	.4	2,690	387	2,948	171,614
(2) Public exigency.....	5,081,593	13.7	2,461,358	582,858	827,784	1,209,593	6,028,574	13.9	2,319,437	1,640,269	1,052,505	1,016,363
(3) Purchases not more than \$2,500.....	1,704,868	4.6	461,560	513,610	378,776	350,922	1,841,300	4.2	493,488	597,523	381,909	368,380
(4) Personal or professional services.....	92,431	.3	34,843	41,959	15,629	0	90,549	.2	51,159	27,846	11,544	0
(5) Services of educational institutions.....	383,649	1.0	107,819	159,384	116,446	0	453,955	1.1	102,660	188,452	162,842	1
(6) Purchases outside United States.....	1,934,316	5.2	659,179	694,779	230,799	349,559	2,263,460	5.2	798,833	805,862	253,345	405,420
(7) Medicine or medical supplies.....	126,742	.3	2,227	2,455	1,403	120,657	144,514	.3	3,476	1,250	1,384	138,404
(8) Supplies purchased for authorized resale.....	230,439	.6	56,487	49,261	102,541	22,150	218,741	.5	68,559	19,190	109,882	21,110
(9) Perishable or nonperishable subsistence.....	1,088,222	2.9	61,865	44,951	135,207	846,199	1,178,015	2.7	80,241	59,806	160,754	877,214
(10) Impractical to secure competition by formal advertising.....	5,746,988	15.5	1,386,531	1,842,956	2,194,627	322,874	7,521,549	17.3	1,564,265	2,147,709	3,253,154	556,412
(11) Experimental, developmental, test, or research.....	4,495,669	12.1	1,084,911	961,576	2,449,149	33	4,848,162	11.2	1,080,291	1,292,607	2,475,246	18
(12) Classified purchases.....	122,571	.3	74,284	44,736	3,551	0	129,148	.3	106,378	19,931	2,839	0
(13) Technical equipment requiring standardization and interchangeability of parts.....	105,630	.3	2,461	43,119	53,769	6,281	132,084	.3	22,997	31,789	65,062	12,236
(14) Technical or specialized supplies requiring substantial initial investment or extended period of preparation for manufacturing.....	6,039,207	16.2	831,676	2,613,892	2,593,639	0	6,500,576	15.0	976,180	3,189,760	2,334,636	0
(15) Negotiation after advertising.....	9,889	(*)	6,225	3,530	108	26	2,280	(*)	1,090	789	401	0
(16) Purchases to keep facilities available in the interest of national defense or industrial mobilization.....	2,171,779	5.8	1,455,618	349,458	364,256	2,447	3,292,966	7.6	2,184,424	455,979	650,227	2,336
(17) Otherwise authorized by law.....	754,753	2.0	175,160	320,682	198,338	60,573	829,557	1.9	206,877	364,480	172,974	85,226

* Use of the joint procedure was discontinued on July 1, 1965; this value represents modifications in fiscal year 1966 to contracts awarded under this procedure prior to July 1.

† Less than 0.05 percent.

PROCUREMENT BY CIVILIAN EXECUTIVE AGENCIES, 12 MONTHS ENDED JUNE 30, 1967

[Procurements of more than \$100 by size of business and type of procurement]

[illegible]

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PROCUREMENT BY CIVILIAN EXECUTIVE AGENCIES, 12 MONTHS ENDED JUNE 30, 1967—Continued
[Procurements of more than \$100 by size of business and type of procurement]

Procuring agency	Total procurement			Procurements awarded by reporting agency									From established sources ¹		
	From small business			Advertised			Negotiated						From small business		
	Total amount	Amount	Percent	Total amount	From small business		Small business set-asides			Other negotiated			Total amount	Amount	Percent
					Amount	Percent	Total amount	Percent of total procurement	Percent of total small business	Total amount	From small business	Percent			
OTHER INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENTS															
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	\$225,433	\$26,986	12.0	-----	-----	-----	\$1,798	0.8	6.7	\$22,724	\$13,048	57.4	\$200,911	\$12,140	6.0
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	56,284	27,949	49.7	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	10,532	10,532	100.0	45,752	17,417	38.1
National Capital Housing Authority.....	7,319,721	7,136,737	97.5	\$6,876,697	\$6,631,305	99.3	-----	-----	-----	418,460	382,053	91.3	224,564	123,379	54.9
National Science Foundation.....	2,910,091	2,021,436	69.5	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	2,458,866	1,882,511	76.6	451,225	138,925	30.8
Panama Canal Company.....	26,096,863	13,309,400	51.0	8,192,330	4,178,089	51.0	-----	-----	-----	17,216,104	8,780,212	51.0	688,429	351,099	51.0
Selective Service System.....	1,959,028	522,735	26.7	452,528	3,612	.8	2,216	.1	.4	55,613	46,751	84.1	1,448,671	470,156	32.5
Smithsonian Institution.....	4,512,649	3,436,532	76.2	1,400,335	1,095,050	78.2	-----	-----	-----	2,660,381	2,177,795	81.9	451,933	163,687	36.2
Tax Court of the United States.....	76,612	20,341	26.6	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	10,184	5,668	55.7	66,428	14,673	22.1
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	429,421,199	106,464,069	24.8	375,948,342	997,799,293	26.5	-----	-----	-----	51,764,190	6,491,762	12.5	1,708,667	173,014	10.1

¹ Federal supply schedules and similar contract sources through other agencies.

² Total excludes Atomic Energy Commission. Cost reimbursed agreements for operation and construction of large-scale facilities account for a large portion of AEC procurement.

³ Federal Aviation Administration, St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Federal Highway Administration, Federal Railroad Administration, and U.S. Coast Guard are now incorporated under the Department of Transportation in accordance with memorandum from the Office of the Secretary of Transportation dated Aug. 11, 1967.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 19, 1968

CHANGE IN OUR SOCIETY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thoughtful and impressive commencement addresses of the recent graduation period was delivered by Mr. John Swearingen, chairman of Standard Oil Co. Indiana, at the commencement exercises at Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill., on June 9.

Because of Mr. Swearingen's respected role in the business community, I believe his profound and very timely views deserve kind spirited review. Therefore, I insert his address in the RECORD at this point:

CHANGE IN OUR SOCIETY

(By John E. Swearingen, chairman, Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), commencement address at Illinois College in Jacksonville, Ill., June 9, 1968)

Let me say first that I come to this platform with mixed emotions. It is an honor to be asked to take part in such an event, and I am duly appreciative on this score.

On the other hand, I am well aware that commencement addresses in general are in the nature of necessary evils—a sort of primitive ritual which has to be endured as part of the price of entry into society.

The parents are primarily interested in seeing some official recognition of success in an undertaking in which they have invested heavily over the years; the graduates are properly impatient to get on with their affairs; and the fancies of the faculty are already turning to the next wave of students soon to engulf them.

Nor is this any bed of roses for the speaker, particularly in present times. Many commencement addresses in the past have tended to be largely pep-talks—a sort of academic replay of Henry the Fifth trying to fire up his troops on the eve of Agincourt.

For a number of reasons, this approach is inappropriate today. Anything that sounds like an exhortation to get out there and win brings quickly to mind the very real contest in which we are engaged in Southeast Asia—a contest, moreover, for which most students have demonstrated a clear lack of enthusiasm.

The present generation of students has made it pretty plain that they are not overly impressed by the wisdom of their elders, nor even with a good deal of the social inheritance they are going to receive. Many profess to see a lot of things wrong with our society, and are eager to change them.

They are not alone in this, of course. All of us would admit to varying degrees of imperfection in our institutions, and to a great deal of unfinished business along the road we are trying to follow to a better society. But the differences between the views held by today's younger generation and the adult community appear to be unusually sharp. The traditional gap between the generations seems—on some points, at least—to have widened into something closer to a chasm.

Among the unfortunate effects of this situation is a communications barrier of wide dimensions. It is certainly great enough to give any commencement speaker an uneasy feeling that many of his younger listeners are likely to greet anything he has to say with a large measure of skepticism.

This being the case, I will not attempt to offer any insights on a rational solution in Vietnam, a course to greater social and eco-

nomie equality for our citizens, or toward rebuilding our cities—or any of the other specific matters of concern to all of us.

Instead, let me simply say a word on the nature of this occasion and some aspects of it on which we should be able to agree. This is called a commencement, because it does signify a beginning. The award of your degrees is looked upon as a mark of your readiness to begin an adult role in society. Many of you are already adult beyond the levels attained by your predecessors at this point in life. As products of the United States in the space age, you are probably the most sophisticated and highly-educated generation ever produced, and a large proportion of you will be going on to still further education.

You are the products of a society which has been affluent, permissive to the young, and education-oriented beyond anything ever dreamed of up to now. A large percentage of your contemporaries throughout the world are still economically in the Stone Age, and intellectually closer to the Dark Ages.

Taken together with the position of world leadership occupied by your country—whether you are happy or not about such a role—this is going to make your lot a demanding one. But your first order of business is not much different in essence from that faced by any of your predecessors. Sooner or later, the young have to prepare to take over—if any kind of continuous society and its benefits are going to be preserved.

In simple cultures, this happens rather early. Coming of age in Samoa takes place at about thirteen. In our complex environment, we think we are doing well to turn out a medical doctor by the age of thirty. But eventually the time comes, and with it comes better understanding of some of the problems faced by those who have tried before to improve on their own heritage.

The heady awareness that you are at last free, and on your own, is—or will shortly be—tempered by the realization that you also have to face a lot of new responsibilities.

One of the drawbacks of being on your own is simply the fact that—to varying degrees—you are. Once on your own, you become responsible for your own support, for the support of whatever family you choose to have, and for a share of the support of the government, the educational system, the military establishment, and all of the other institutions essential to our lives today.

And one of the discoveries which you will have to make is as old as the race itself. Throughout history, mankind has had to struggle hard for physical survival. The essentials to support human life—food, clothing, housing—have had to be wrung from the earth at considerable effort. There are only a handful of countries which have managed this very well after thousands of years of trying. Here in the United States, we have mastered the problem of physical survival with such success that we have created a society of superabundance, by the standards of the rest of the world. In terms of Asia, Africa, or South America, the people we call poor would be considered very wealthy.

But, in the midst of our relative abundance, we must not lose sight of reality. There is a controlling principle that applies across the board, to rich nation and poor nation, to rich man and poor man, to intellectual and artisan, to capitalist and communist. Expressed in contemporary—if somewhat inelegant—form, this reads: "There is no such thing as a free lunch."

In a primitive society, this is self-evident. In a complex society such as our own, it is not so obvious, and it becomes possible for many people to conclude that we are so advanced that such limitations no longer apply. Probably the major force which fosters such an illusion is the federal government. By preempting and redistributing a large share of

our national output in the form of taxes, the government leads the recipients to take the free lunch for granted. They soon come back for more.

I hope it is clear that I am not speaking in literal terms, about free lunches for school children or anything of that sort. What I refer to is the gigantic federal lunch counter at which there is something for everybody: for the college and university; for the student and the illiterate; for the defense contractor and the farmer; for the indigent and the investor; for home owners and dependents; for the unemployed, the aged, the blind, and for veterans. The range of federal largesse has become so grand that there is hardly a person in the land who does not benefit from it in some way—and this increasingly conceals the fact that somebody has to pay for the lunch.

We need to remember that no society can dispose of more than it creates—and this is just as true in a modern industrial nation as it is in a band of Maori tribesmen. The ability of each succeeding generation to improve its society is limited by what that generation is capable of producing—and this applies to ideas as well as goods and services. It takes the tangible fruits of somebody's work to support the philosopher in his ivory tower, and the student in his classroom.

A truly free ride through life is a fiction: somebody pays for the ride, even in an affluent society. Today's parents have been rather severely criticized for rearing a group which is said to have no comprehension of this fact. Having grown to adulthood in times of unparalleled prosperity, you are said to be economic illiterates who take good times for granted and assume there is no bottom to the horn of plenty.

I am not sure this is really the case, but even if it is, the day of enlightenment is close at hand. You will soon be called upon for your own contribution to the common effort, and you will soon be parents and taxpayers. Any of the economic facts of life which may have escaped you will be brought to your attention.

You will discover that economic freedom, social freedom, and political freedom are indivisible. However you may define the kind of life you want for yourself and for your children, you are going to have to pay for it. Indeed, it is your ability to pay that will largely determine the alternatives open to you and to your family.

On a broader level, this same limitation will apply to your generation as a whole. There will be a price-tag on any efforts you choose to make to improve the physical, social, or intellectual landscape of your neighborhood, your community, your metropolitan area, your state, or the nation as a whole.

Whatever the cost, you will have to pay most of the bill for any experiments you undertake. In addition, you will be assessed for payments on a lot of overdue bills you are going to inherit—in the form of federal deficits run up before you arrived on the scene by people who had their own improvement schemes and couldn't care less about who eventually had to meet them.

Your legacy will be a mixed one, at best; but if history is any guide, so will be the one you transmit. Nobody knows yet what you are going to do with your inheritance. If, as some of the alarmists are convinced, you are dedicated to consumption and mediation rather than production and creation, you could lead us into a monumental economic decline which would resolve a good number of our current dilemmas both at home and abroad.

Our foreign commitments would evaporate like dew in the sunshine the moment we were unable to underwrite them. On the domestic scene, a real, hair-curling depression would certainly lessen the pressures for greater economic equality when it became

evident that even our so-called affluent society could not support current social programs, much less expand them.

I cannot see your generation in such a role. Most of the evidence says that you are in the main idealistic, oriented to challenge, and determined to do things better than they have been done up to now. If this is the case, a large percentage of your best representatives will have to devote their careers to the main business of society—creation of the wealth and capital necessary to underwrite improvement, change, and progress.

There is one tendency on the part of some members of your generation which is not so promising—and I refer to the recent events on many campuses across the country. Forcible seizure of college property, deliberate violation of both university regulations and civil law, plus complete paralysis of institutions of higher learning, is a peculiar route to attain what any group of students considers its "legitimate" demands. The riddle is further compounded when it turns out that some of the demands are quite unrelated to either the purposes or capacities of our colleges and universities. If, for example, we are to allow important aspects of foreign policy to be determined by the current inhabitants of the nation's campuses, we shall be obliged to scrap elementary common sense along with the Constitution.

In any event, the very legitimacy of the demands is badly tainted by their advocacy through admittedly illegal means in a democratic society. There is a case to be made for student revolts in countries which deny them the elementary rights of free expression; it is hard to see such a case here. We have more laws to protect individual and collective rights than any other society in history. Deliberate violation of the established rights of others to attain new rights of your own is neither a formula designed for a free society nor does it speak very highly of the imagination of the students who can find no other route toward their goals.

Some of the basic personal freedoms which have lately been violated on our campuses trace back to those won from a despotic king at Runnymede nearly 800 years ago in the form of the Magna Carta, and have had to be defended ever since. In my judgment, they are still worth defending—as is the basic concept of a government of laws, not of men.

While most laws are admittedly imperfect, the imperfections displayed by individuals who place themselves above the law are vastly greater—whether they happen to be juvenile anarchists or adult assassins. I think this point has been adequately demonstrated in a series of tragic events over the last few years, and I trust the message will not be lost on those of you who will face the job of fashioning the society of tomorrow.

If casual disregard for order and convention is to be the hallmark of the next generation, we should all have grounds for concern. In the process of taking over the direction of society, you would likely wreck the controls. However, I see no reason to conclude that this is the case. Those students who are determined to get on with their education—despite any grievances they may feel about the way the plan is run—outnumber the advocates of militant protest by an overwhelming margin.

I remain sanguine about our collective future, and have no serious doubts about your ability to play a constructive part in it. No intelligent generation as concerned about individual freedom and self-expression as yours is apt to permit itself to be used as a revolutionary instrument to destroy the rights and freedoms of others.

I am confident that you will accept the responsibility that inevitably goes along with freedom, and will work constructively to rebuild what is shabby in our social

structure without considering it first necessary to tear down the whole edifice and start over again.

There is no room in the concept of passing on the torch for its use as a tool of arson; and there is surely more promise in the philosophy of Jefferson and Lincoln than in that of Bonnie and Clyde.

Congratulations and good luck to all of you.

GUN CONTROL

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Alhambra, Calif., Post-Advocate on June 15, 1968.

The editorial emphasizes the need for a balanced approach to the task of determining what additional gun-control legislation is necessary.

I commend the Post-Advocate views on this important issue to the attention of the Congress, as follows:

CLAMOR FOR GUN CONTROLS

Even before the President approved one measure putting interstate restrictions on sale of handguns the clamor was on in Congress for even a stricter law.

The new bill proposed would also restrict the sale of rifles and shotguns and ammunition across state lines and all such sales to persons under 21.

The pressure for the new measure was understandable in view of the recent emotional tragedy in Los Angeles.

Unfortunately, there also was considerable emotion in the opposite direction, directed against American sportsmen's groups that would like to be able to buy rifles and shotguns for legitimate hunting purposes.

Despite the charges, these groups are not warped, anti-social, anti-American or kooks. Their interest in limiting crimes and preventing senseless killings is as strong as that of any Americans.

Sports groups desire to protect a legitimate recreational pursuit is valid. Also valid is the fear of many of the Americans who own an estimated 100 million firearms for the protection of their lives and homes.

As usual with emotional polarization, the truth perhaps lies between the extremes. It should be possible to reconcile the divergences between the sportsmen's groups and the law-enforcement officers who strongly urge more controls on the sales of firearms to criminal elements.

Certainly all possible should be done to keep all weapons from the hands of criminals, juveniles, addicts, mental cases and others without the intelligence and education to use them properly. All possible should be done also to prohibit the sales of cannons, bazookas and other such weapons that have no proper civilian use. California has done much in these directions with its firearms law, which is considered a model.

Something urgent must be done also to curb the growing use of narcotics which is leading many youths in the nation to moral degeneracy and perhaps contributing as much to the soaring crime rate as any other single cause.

But it also must be realized that regardless of how many laws are passed, these alone are not a panacea for the violence and crime rampant throughout the nation.

Much of the public desire to acquire fire-

arms is because of the degeneration of protection resulting from the riots, crime and permissiveness.

And the blame for that breakdown rests in many instances at the federal level because the supreme court has limited the powers of police departments and the official attitude is one of leniency.

It is time for cool heads as well as emotion in Congress as the gun debate unfolds or the traditional heritage of Americans to use weapons for recreation and self-defense will be endangered.

RHODESIAN SANCTIONS REJECTED BY BRITISH LORDS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the obnoxious economic boycott against Rhodesia by the militant U.N. minorities has now even been rejected by the British House of Lords. Apparently even the British Lords are awakening to the fictitious obligations of the Red-Black power U.N. group.

It is a strange paradox for us Americans who fight in Vietnam, talk peace in Paris, yet in New York participate in the U.N. international "conspiracy" against independent Rhodesia and the threat of getting involved in another shooting conflict on the African Continent.

We criticize the British, yet their representatives at least get to vote on the U.N. decrees—something denied the U.S. Congress. Our participation in the U.N. wars is by Executive order of the President as if in a subservient obligation to the U.N.

Mr. Speaker, I insert a clipping from the Washington Post for June 19:

LORDS VOTE DOWN SANCTIONS ORDER, DEFEYING MOVES TO ABOLISH CHAMBER

LONDON, June 18.—The House of Lords voted today to reject a government order extending sanctions against Rhodesia, to the delight of those who would like to see the non-elective chamber abolished. The vote was 193 to 184, closer than expected.

This is the first time that the peers have voted down an Order in Council issued by a British government, and Prime Minister Wilson is now bound to take note of demands that the House should be eliminated.

But the Labor government is unlikely to do anything quite so drastic, for these reasons:

The vote of the Lords will not nullify the order, which remains in effect until July 8 and can then be renewed for another 28 days, subjected to a second vote by Parliament. It is deemed unlikely that the peers would be so reckless as to vote down the order a second time.

Even radicals within the government believe that the chamber performs a useful function in perfecting legislation enacted by the Commons. Moreover, because peers are not elected they can pay less heed to popular prejudice on such controversial issues as homosexual-law reform.

Finally—and this is the most potent argument—the House serves a very contemporary purpose, for all its Gothic trappings. It provides a way to reward party stalwarts and to take the sting out of dismissal by giving a title to overaged ministers. Most of the Lords gain their seats by virtue of heredity.

In Cabinet circles, it is felt that the effect of today's vote will be to hasten reform of the House of Lords. An all-party conference is now discussing ways of limiting the number of peers who can vote as a way of reducing the chamber's lopsided Conservative majority.

That majority was not as evident as many expected in today's vote. One explanation for the narrow margin was that some Tory peers resented what they felt was interference by Rhodesian Prime Minister Ian Smith, who had said in an interview that their lordships should "certainly vote against this order."

Nonadmirers of the House of Lords speculated that the Ascot races this week also proved too strong a counter-attraction to some rabid right-wing peers who were expected to make a rare voting appearance.

Still, during debate there were some notable speeches. One in particular was by Lord Alport, a Tory with liberal views on Africa who was once a British high commissioner in Salisbury. He urged his fellow Tories to at least abstain on the vote because if Britain failed to carry out its U.N. obligations it would lose what control it had over Rhodesia whose white-minority government declared its independence in 1965.

In another speech, Lord Snow, the novelist and a Laborite, called attention to a Gallup poll in today's Daily Telegraph. It showed that 41 per cent of those questioned felt that British actions against Rhodesia were not strong enough; 16 per cent thought they were about right and 16 per cent felt they were too strong.

The poll also showed that only 29 per cent would support the House of Lords in a fight on Rhodesia, 32 per cent would back the government and 39 per cent would support neither. Observers believed that the close vote in the House of Lords showed that the poll had not gone entirely unnoticed.

BALTIMORE MARINE SERGEANT KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, S. Sgt. John K. Brazier, a fine young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend his bravery and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

CITY MARINE DIES ON VIET PATROL—SERGEANT, 32, KILLED IN ACTION NEAR QUANG TRI

A 32-year-old marine from Baltimore has been killed in Vietnam, the Department of Defense announced yesterday.

He was Staff Sgt. John K. Brazier, son of Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth E. Brazier, of 746 McCabe avenue.

Sergeant Brazier was killed June 6 while on patrol near Quang Tri in South Vietnam, his father said yesterday.

In Vietnam since November, Sergeant Brazier had been stationed at Da Nang.

His father said that, in letters home, Sergeant Brazier had said that there was "nothing doing" there. He said his son's only complaint was of the heat.

A native of Baltimore, Sergeant Brazier enlisted in the Marine Corps at the age of 17. He served at various bases in the United States, on two Mediterranean tours, and aboard several ships. He was on the aircraft carrier U.S.S. Shangri-La before going to Vietnam.

In addition to his parents, Sergeant Bra-

zier is survived by three sisters, Mrs. Louise Siemlenski, of Glen Burnie, Mrs. Bernardine List, of Baltimore, Mrs. Catherine Webb, of Hillendale, and a brother, Leonard J. Brazier, of Baltimore.

THE MURDER OF SENATOR KENNEDY: WHO IS SICK, WHO IS TO BLAME

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor and privilege of representing the Fourth Congressional District of Virginia. In that district are many outstanding newspapers. A majority of these papers are weekly, although we have several daily and several biweekly newspapers. One of the outstanding newspapers in our district is the Courier-Record of Blackstone, Va. It has a long and illustrious history of faithfully publishing the news impartially. For years it has had one of the strongest editorial staffs and so recognized in the newspaper fraternity.

On June 13, 1968, there appeared in the Courier-Record an editorial entitled "The Murder of Senator Kennedy: Who Is Sick, Who Is To Blame." This editorial describes better than any I have read the dilemma now faced by America—yes; all America. It points out cogently the cause of our trouble, who is to blame for the trouble, and why we are in trouble in America. I wish every red-blooded American who is interested in our Nation, who is a loyal patriotic citizen of our country could read this editorial. It says what I have been trying to say in my feeble way for a long time.

Mr. Speaker, I hope every Member of Congress in the House and in the Senate will take time out and read carefully this editorial and to cogitate over it and let us see if we cannot get together to do something worthwhile to save America and our way of life before it is too late.

I commend the editor for his splendid analysis of our situation and thank him for pointing out so well the dilemma we face and the dire necessity of acting quickly to relieve this perilous situation now confronting our country.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the editorial:

THE MURDER OF SENATOR KENNEDY: WHO IS SICK, WHO IS TO BLAME

The murder of Senator Robert Kennedy was a terrible act which no American can condone. No matter how vigorously one opposed his political views he was a human being, a son, a father, a husband and an official of the United States government. His senseless killing, following the similar fate of his older brother and late president reaches into the hearts of even the coldest among us. Today, at least, it appears that the man who was to have been the next president of this land, is dead. Certainly millions of Americans are feeling real grief at his loss and his murder immediately brought forth cries of anguish from officials throughout the nation. It is some of these statements we want to examine.

They say our land is sick. We disagree. America is getting sick but its sickness is

being caused by officials in places of extreme power. When the president sits by and allows cities to be sacked by thieves and arsonists, that's sickness. When mobs can loot and burn while police stand by afraid to shoot, that's sickness. When the supreme court allows known and convicted criminals of all sorts to walk away thumbing their noses at police, that's sickness. When the judicial processes are so turned around that the rights of a murderer are more important than the innocent person lying dead, that's sickness.

If Americans are sick it is because they have gotten to the point of nausea from hearing their president complain about the lawlessness across the land on the one hand while he does nothing on the other to see that laws are enforced and criminals punished. If Americans are sick it is because they are fed up with seeing those who won't work live comfortably off the sweat of those who do. If Americans are sick it is because they have had a belly full of liberal politicians who would have them believe you've got to be a "Soul Brother" or you're guilty of mistreating fellow Americans. If Americans are sick it is because their leadership is sick.

They say all Americans share in the guilt of the recent assassinations. We disagree. The millions of Americans who go about their daily tasks, earning a living, providing for their families, trying to do the best they can, share no guilt for the death of Robert Kennedy or anyone else. The liberals in this country who have done away with the death penalty in a number of states and who are trying to ban it nationwide, share the guilt. Those who stir up peaceful Americans, causing them to participate in riots and marches and movements under the guise of gaining riches or rights at the expense of others, share the guilt. Those who have taken the Bible out of our schools and put TV trash in our living rooms, share the guilt. Our friends and neighbors are not guilty and neither are we.

There is no question that this country is slowly being destroyed from within and without. At a time when Americans need to be united and feel thankful for this great and free land, young men are burning draft cards and spitting on the American flag. Parents have abdicated their responsibilities in many cases and the family unit is little more than a group of people residing in the same house. Persons once of strong faith have been shaken by ministers who forsake the Gospel for marches and demonstrations. If God is dead he has died first on the movie lot, in our universities and finally in our homes.

If this country is to be saved there must be a return to those things which have proven successful for the nation over the years. The present administration in Washington can not get us out of this mess. On the political scene today there is no one visible in the Democratic Party able to lead us out of the wilderness. The defeat of Barry Goldwater for president almost four years ago has been one of the most devastating blows dealt our nation. Hopefully, by November, there will come forth a man of courage and wisdom who can be elected president and who, with the support of the many millions of good honest Americans, save our land. November may be our last chance. If we don't show improvement soon America will be sick, deadly sick.

"OUR LEADERS FALL"

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include a poem by Mr. Ted Cook of Brilliant, Ohio, entitled "Our Leaders Fall":

OUR LEADERS FALL

Our Widows Weep and Children Cry,
Throughout the land our leaders die,
And Justice Sleeps as leaders fall,
Throughout the World there hangs a Pall.

Our Country stands for Freedom's right,
Throughout the world our sons will fight,
The Stars and Stripes will always be,
A Symbol bright to Keep men free.

And, yet, Within our land Will Walk
Men With guns, As Killers Stalk,
And People Mourn as great men fall,
Our leaders, then, must hear the call.

If We are, then, to lead the World,
In Freedom's Might, Our Flag Unfurled
We must have Justice in our land,
Our leaders, then, must make their stand.

REMARKS OF SENATOR PHILIP A. HART, 40TH ANNIVERSARY BROTHERHOOD AWARD DINNER, SOUTH BEND-MISHAWAKA CHAPTER OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS, SOUTH BEND, IND., MAY 23, 1968

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, every year the South Bend-Mishawaka Chapter of the National Conference on Christians and Jews presents Brotherhood Awards to three leading citizens of the area who have made outstanding contributions to the cause of brotherhood and understanding.

This year the three honorees were Mr. Stanley J. Ladd, president of the St. Joseph County AFL-CIO Council; Dr. Herbert A. Schiller, a physician; and E. Blair Warner, a businessman.

I was glad, myself, to be on hand to pay tribute to these three outstanding men of my home community and to read the address prepared for this occasion by our distinguished colleague, Senator PHILIP A. HART, of Michigan, who was required by the pressure of important legislative business to remain on the Senate floor.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of Senator HART's splendid address:

REMARKS OF SENATOR PHILIP A. HART, 40TH ANNIVERSARY BROTHERHOOD AWARD DINNER, SOUTH BEND-MISHAWAKA CHAPTER OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS, SOUTH BEND, IND., MAY 23, 1968

Certainly, I am very happy to be here. A thriving Roundtable group like this one is always a sign of an enlightened community.

It's not evidence, however, that anyone in Washington would need before guessing the progressive temper of this town. Because in Washington, we know that John Brademas comes from South Bend . . . and any community that sends a man like John Brademas to Washington must . . . we figure . . . be composed of an intelligent citizenry.

So we had an idea of what a fine city this is even before Look Magazine discovered you.

Thanks to the combined efforts of Dr. Schiller here and an aggressive economic

development program . . . South Bend can honestly say . . . four years after the Studebaker shutdown:

"Look, no cavities."

The real tribute to Indiana hospitality . . . I suppose . . . came during the Presidential primary when the vote was thoughtfully split so that everyone could claim a victory.

Governor Branigan, someone told me . . . would have done better here except that many weren't sure they could Vote Hoosier and still keep the All-America title.

But just because your primary in the light of all the subsequent analyses and explanations seemed inconclusive, don't think it will be forgotten.

Indiana has already gone into the history books . . . and don't ever forget it . . . as the place where Bobby Kennedy got a haircut.

After the primaries, maybe this state has become understandably weary of politicians who come in with advice and solutions.

The fact that you invite another outside politician in to be the speaker at this affair can only be regarded as a tribute to your sense of duty . . . and your endurance.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND OUR SOCIETY

One of the specialties that happens to have fallen to me in the Senate is Civil Rights and I invite anyone here to raise their hand if they have managed to get through the past 24 hours without already hearing three speeches, watching two programs or reading an article on that subject.

You might justifiably wonder what could be left to say. Well, probably nothing. But I am not going to betray my profession by keeping quiet just because there is nothing new left to say.

I do not pretend to be a spokesman for the Negro. If I tried, I would be a poor one simply because I am not a Negro. But I think I understand the commodity he is after . . . and it isn't a television set . . . it isn't just a house in the suburbs or a \$3.50 an hour job. It isn't just political influence and it isn't just courteous treatment from the policeman.

The principal commodity that the Negro can no longer get along without is esteem . . . the coin made up on one side of self-respect and on the other side of respect from others.

To this audience I need read no lesson in Negro history. We all know of slavery and its degrading effects. We all know that for hundreds of years, Negroes were carefully isolated from all the values that motivate the white man and then were turned loose in a society where the white majority could muster little respect for them because their values were so different.

So after all these years, the nation seems to have on its hands a community that is determined above all to enlarge its store of self-respect.

Now the route to this goal might be very complicated, but the goal itself is not—and we would all do well to remember it because it is not a goal that anyone can reasonably quarrel with . . . although many may dispute the merits of the routes chosen to achieve it.

TRADITIONAL ROADS TO PRESTIGE

Well, in our society, what are the traditional roads to prestige? How does a person enlarge himself in his own eyes and in the eyes of his peers?

Education is an approved route. But we don't need any further documentaries on the merits of the education Negroes have been afforded in this country for the last 300 years.

Hard work is an approved route. Of course, that sort of depends on your ability to get a good job. And while no one in this country has ever failed to get a job because he was white, we may all have heard of some cases

where a man failed to get a job because he was black.

Moving your family into a nice neighborhood is one way to gain prestige and self-esteem. On the other hand, self-respect is likely to suffer a sharp decline if you are turned down without even being asked if you have the down payment.

Saving money for extras—maybe a family vacation—is a respectable endeavor in this society. But neither your respect nor your savings are likely to grow if you know in advance that they'll turn you away at the resort, or maybe receive you so icily that there's no fun in it.

Yes, there's another way to preserve self-esteem in the face of humiliation and the history books are full of examples. Sometimes it's called violent revolution, sometimes disorder, sometimes riot.

Unhappily, it does work. After riots in Detroit and across the nation, sociological reports were full of interviews with rioters who felt some pride—perhaps for the first time in their lives—about what they had done.

OURS IS A MIDDLE CLASS SOCIETY

But we also live in a middle-class society that is quite properly appalled by violence and destruction. This society responds not with respect but with fear.

Now fear is a very poor substitute for respect but it is an improvement on contempt. This, as I see it, is the real danger that the Riot Commission talks about when it discusses the danger that two elements of our society will pull further and further apart.

That Negroes, giving up on getting respect, will settle for fear. And whites, in fear, will be unable to grant Negroes the privileges of respect.

Certainly, many Negroes . . . fearful that the continuing contempt they see in white eyes will be reflected in black souls . . . advocate withdrawal from the white community so that growing Negro self-respect will not be stunted by the mirrored disrespect of the majority. It is a case not entirely without logic.

And many whites are not eager for closer contact with a society they regard with mingled distrust and apprehension.

How easy it is for the white to declare, "Look, I can't help what happened 300 years ago or in my parents' day. If you want respect, get yourself cleaned up. Get a good job. Take care of your family decently. Get some education and don't use that ghetto language. Then you'll get respect."

And how easy it is for the Negro, who remembers anything of his own life and knows anything about the history of his people to respond, "Look, for 300 years you white s.o.b.'s have done everything you could to keep us from achieving that checklist."

One of the things we most desperately need—and I know this has been said so often that it is becoming a burdensome cliché—is dialogue.

THE NEED FOR DIALOGUE

Dialogue such as is provided by roundtables like this one and dialogue such as is provided by the Poor People's March in Washington. No one can expect to get everything that he wants but everyone can expect to be listened to.

And if we all take pains to remember that self-esteem is the true Negro goal—and I feel strongly that it is—perhaps the chasm will not yawn as wide.

Because it is the sort of goal that no one should feel compelled to stop another from achieving.

And if we ever reach the point where the esteem to be accorded a man is not measured out while he is still 50 feet away, then we will have done more than upgrade the Negroes of America.

We will have upgraded America.

**HON. CARL D. PERKINS DELIVERS
COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AT
LANDER COLLEGE, GREENWOOD,
S.C.**

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, on May 26, 1968, my distinguished colleague and warm personal friend, the Honorable CARL D. PERKINS, delivered an outstanding address to the graduating class of Lander College in my hometown of Greenwood, S.C. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] delivered a splendid and most timely address which will long be remembered by the graduating class of 1968 and the families and friends who were in attendance.

Mr. Speaker, Lander College is a co-educational liberal arts college which moved to Greenwood in 1904 from Williamson. Since that time, Lander has been blessed with expert and experienced leadership which has guided her to a place of prominence within the academic community.

Under the expert guidance of President E. Donald Herd, the superb and dedicated Lander College community strives to make a reality of its primary purpose: that of "developing the whole man, not merely that part of him which is capable of learning."

Mr. Speaker, Lander alumni everywhere hold responsible positions and take an important part in the religious, civic, and social life of their communities. Each one, whether a businessman, teacher, musician, nurse, secretary, technician, or homemaker, has had the advantage of excellent professional training and a cultural environment in a Christian institution.

Lander College is a tremendous asset to Greenwood, to South Carolina, and to the Nation as a whole. President Herd and his superb staff are to be commended for their efforts, and congratulated for a job well done in preparing the youth of our country to meet the challenges which face them today.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the memorable address presented by the Honorable CARL PERKINS on this important occasion to the attention of my colleagues and the people of the United States, as follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS DELIVERED BY
CHAIRMAN CARL D. PERKINS, COMMITTEE
ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, U.S. HOUSE
OF REPRESENTATIVES, LANDER COLLEGE,
GREENWOOD, S.C.

President Herd, distinguished faculty, honored guests, members of the Class of 1968, parents and friends, it is a pleasure and an honor to be here today and have this opportunity to extend my sincere congratulations on your achievement and to say to you good luck in the future!

It is a particular pleasure to be in the Congressional District and hometown of one of my most distinguished and able colleagues in the House of Representatives, the Honorable William Jennings Bryan Dorn. His record in Congress is truly an outstanding one—a record of dedication and generous service not only to his district but to all South Carolinians and to all Americans.

Today and during the next few weeks, on over two thousand college campuses across the nation, commencement speakers like myself will be spending hopefully just a few minutes sharing with young men and women their thoughts on a variety of topics. I suspect that many invitations to address the Class of 1968 were accepted with hesitation as well as enthusiasm. Enthusiasm because it offers an opportunity to participate in a festive occasion, an occasion which signifies achievements for students, parents and faculty. But accepted also with hesitation, because of the concern that today there exists an even greater communications gap between the members of your generation—I understand described by many as the "now" generation—and my generation, which perhaps you might wish to describe as the "passed" p-a-s-s-e-d generation.

If it is difficult for members of our respective generations to effectively communicate with one another—then I am sure many will argue that it is even more difficult—if not impossible—for a politician out of the "passed" generation to bridge the communications gap. Yet a politician may be able to bring to the situation a certain expertise which will make the encounter a worthwhile and productive one.

If the speaker is a good politician, he will be brief, and this afternoon I intend to be, at least in this respect, a good politician. A politician is also a pragmatist—and as a pragmatist, I should like to discuss with you a subject which is of practical interest to all Americans and of particular interest to students, their parents and faculty. I speak of education—and I would like to share with you some of my thoughts and my concerns about that which is now being described as the Number One business of the American people.

For those who have been privileged to participate in the academic program here at Lander where an individualized and personalized educational environment is stressed, I suspect that any description of education as a business enterprise is somewhat offensive. Yet, that it is such—that it is big business—cannot be denied. Educational expenditures for this year passed the fifty billion dollar mark. That is close to seven percent of the gross national product. Education was the primary occupation of sixty million Americans this last academic year, with over 57 million students attending class and two million teachers and faculty members in the classroom. This means that in a nation of 200 million people, more than three out of ten were directly involved in the educational process.

Last fall's enrollment set an all-time high with the largest percentage increase in higher education.

There has been a gratifying reduction in school dropout rates and today, about three-fourths of our young people finish high school.

One adult in every six is earning a bachelor's degree now.

There has been a rapid increase in current expenditures per elementary and secondary school pupil—an increase of approximately 81% between 1956-57 and 1966-67.

There has been a rapid rise in federal grants to education at all levels. The increase to elementary and secondary schools was from \$700 million dollars in 1964 to \$2.4 billion dollars in 1966.

Federal grants to higher education rose from \$1.3 billion dollars in 1964 to \$2.7 billion dollars in 1966.

For adult vocational and technical and continuing education, the increase in the same period was from \$200 million dollars to \$900 million dollars.

Today's educational scene in America was described by President Johnson in his Education Message to Congress this year as follows. He said:

"I believe that our time—the mid 1960's—will be remembered as a time of unprecedented achievement in American education."

"The past four years have been a time of unparalleled action."

Fred Hechinger, respected and honored education writer for the New York Times, viewed American education in another way. In an article earlier this year entitled "A Nervous Year for U.S. Educators," he wrote:

"The mood of American education is like that of the starlet who has been pleading for a dramatic lead and, suddenly thrust to the center of the stage, is paralyzed with fright."

Each day the U.S. Office of Education prepares a press digest of newspaper articles dealing with education. A review of the headlines over education stories appearing in newspapers across the country on May 10 this year will demonstrate that indeed American educators should be nervous.

On May 10 a Washington Post headline read "Sit-In Truce at Stanford U. Ranks Some."

On that same day, a New York Times article began "Columbia Officials Split on Penalties for Rebels."

The May 10 edition of the Louisville Courier-Journal carried the headline "Small Country Schools Near End of the Line."

And on that same day, other newspapers carried articles under the following headlines: "Paris will Keep Sorbonne Closed"; "Negro School Panel Ousts 19 Teachers, Defies City"; "House of Representatives Denied Aid to College Rioters"; "New York City School Superintendent Seeks Record Budget"; "24 School Budget Defeats Are Laid to Taxpayer Revolts"; "Why Negroes Seek School Control."

That the Number One business of the American people is troubled—seems also to be a fact which cannot be denied. The demands for power—student power, teacher power, black power, and community power—are being heard as vociferously in the education community as in any other segment of our democracy. Dissatisfaction with the present and concern about the future is being expressed by students who find their educational experience an unrelated one, by parents who are troubled by the campus behavior of their sons and daughters—and by faculty who wonder why the traditional search for truth is not adequate for today's youth.

But there are those also who are optimistic about the future, and I share that optimism. Whether we are proved right will depend upon the full—but rational and responsible—participation of individual Americans and various levels of government in the national effort to provide adequate educational opportunity.

Many of the current inadequacies in education result from the fact that for too many years education was always someone else's responsibility. Educators spoke of the parent's responsibilities; parents of the school's responsibilities; schools of the Federal responsibilities, the Federal Government of the state's, and the states of the local school district's. It was President Truman who made famous the statement that "the buck stops here." And I say that this afternoon—that the buck stops here—for each of us has a responsibility in the educational community whether we be a college president, a state or national legislator, students or their parents, or other American citizens who falsely assume they have no part to play in the educational commitment.

What does all of this mean for you who are graduating today? To begin with, it is necessary first, that you realize you are indeed a privileged group. Not too long ago I saw a study which concluded that a college education is likely to be a sounder investment than playing the stock market. The study

showed that the increased lifetime earnings a man or woman enjoys because of their college degree will average more than they have made if the money spent on college had been put into investments paying dividends of five or ten percent.

But your privilege is far greater than this for, as your college catalog reads, the primary purpose of Lander is to develop the whole man, not merely that part of him which earns a living.

You have been part of an educational process which emphasizes the personal development of the individual student and scholar. And it is important that you take from your college experience a concept of yourself as an individual, not merely as a member of a group whose activities are determined by others rather than by yourself.

Fredrick Nietzsche wrote: "When we talk in company, we lose our unique tone of voice and this leads us to make statements which in no way correspond to our real thoughts."

You need not lose the unique tone of your voice or the individual quality of your thoughts—because of the opportunity which has been yours during the last four years.

Most importantly, if you act as an individual, you will have a greater appreciation and respect for the rights of others. Obligations exist as companions to privileges. George Bernard Shaw defined liberty as meaning responsibility. With your privilege you have the obligation and the responsibility to respect and honor the privileges and rights of others. Irresponsibility in the past has produced many of the deficiencies of today. Irresponsible action—rioting and other unlawful action—will not, however, as some appear to think, correct those deficiencies but rather compound the difficulties. What is required rather is constructive action consistent with law and order and with the rights of others. Society demands this of you, and perhaps even more. For your college catalog also speaks of the development within you of the tools necessary for effective leadership in an ever-changing state, nation and world. Thus, you must not only be aware of issues and problems, but you may also be expected to have solutions. You will be asked not only for financial contributions to the educational community but also asked for contributions of your professional services and of your guidance and counsel. You will be invited not only to join the PTA, but to serve as an active member. Questions will be posed.

Should there be a national comprehensive measure of student achievement?

Should the school year be extended to twelve months?

Should the school day be extended to provide educational opportunities in the late afternoon and evening hours?

Are we providing sufficient support and emphasis for compensatory education programs?

Should we provide universal free higher education in this nation?

To these and many questions like this you will be asked to respond.

My message today is a relatively simple one—I urge that you, individually, continue in your commitment to education and that your commitment be an active one. Many of you have decided upon continuing your education in graduate school. You are to be commended for your decision. Others perhaps are still undecided whether to continue their education. I urge you to give this matter the most serious consideration, for never before has there been a greater demand for persons with advanced degrees. I understand many of you will enter the teaching profession. You are to be congratulated on your decision. I can assure you that your career in the education profession will indeed be a rewarding and satisfying one.

Others will not be directly involved in the education community in the immediate years

ahead. But you will once again, through the education of your children, find yourself very much a part of the education community.

As I indicated to you, President Johnson earlier this year described the past four years as a time of unparalleled action in American education. I am convinced that each succeeding year, more and more will be required and demanded.

I will close with just a few additional thoughts which hopefully will give you some perspective of the future challenges in education to which you should and must direct your active attention.

Though we can take pride in the fact that 50% of our high school graduates went on to college, and that next year over 1.5 million students will receive student assistance through federally supported programs alone, there are still millions of capable American students and their families for whom college is still out of reach.

Encouraging progress has been made in strengthening our capacity to provide meaningful educational programs and services to our mentally and physically handicapped young children. Nevertheless, only 1.8 million secondary school children are receiving special education and training, while another 4.5 million handicapped children are either forced to sit idly in classes with no special training available to them or, in severe instances, remain at home. There are almost no preschool programs for handicapped children. 75,000 teachers for the handicapped are now available, but 200,000 more are needed!

Substantial progress has been made in bridging the gap between school and work. Yet the unemployment rate among youth in this nation is far greater than in any other industrial nation. Eight out of ten school dropouts have never been counseled by school or employment office officials about training or employment opportunities, and four out of every ten high school graduates have never had such counseling. There are no school counselors at all in 13% of the nation's secondary schools and in 90% of its elementary schools.

I could continue to cite area after area where increased efforts are required. These would give additional emphasis to what is already obvious—that if ever there was a time to act positively and constructively toward the fulfillment of the American promise of full educational opportunity—to which so many give lip service but fail to act—that time is now!

Perhaps additional stimulus can be obtained from the very piercing comment of Herbert George Wells:

"Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe."

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY MR. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 4, 1968, I was invited to the White House to attend the signing of the act funding the Inter-American Development Bank. It was a real pleasure to be offered this invitation and I was glad to be present as a courtesy to President Johnson.

While attending these ceremonies at the White House along with several other Members of the House, a quorum call was unexpectedly requested by a

Member who is not of the leadership of either the Republican or Democratic Parties.

As I make every effort to be present on the floor for all votes and quorum calls, I believe this explanation of my necessary absence on the quorum call that afternoon is in order.

STATEMENT OPPOSING THE SUR- CHARGE TAX EXPENDITURE CUT PACKAGE

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, last September 21 I issued a statement supporting President Johnson's proposed 10-percent income tax surcharge. I based my position then on some very strong and convincing economic and social arguments: First, the excessive inflationary trend; second, the pressure of Federal borrowing to raise interest rates; and, third, the unfavorable balance of payments causing the debility of the American dollar abroad.

I felt that the economic well-being of our Nation far outweighed crass political considerations of the general unpopularity of all tax issues. I would have voted for the tax increase then, and I said so. I would vote for it now and would even go so far as to link it with an expenditure cut package not to exceed \$4 billion. On May 29 I so indicated in my vote to instruct the conference committee, and I felt that the \$4 billion expenditure cut would not necessarily slice into vital social programs.

Even when this move failed, and before it was clear that whatever we may save in the household, business, and welfare sectors of our economy is likely to be shunted into expenditures in Vietnam, I still felt that fiscal constraint was so necessary that considerable compromise could be justified in order to buy support necessary to pass the tax bill. Thus, I would vote for the tax even with the severe cut if under the circumstances of its passage the bill would, in fact, assure solution to our fiscal problems. But let us see if it will:

The only way that I could justify these drastic cuts, which will undoubtedly impede the solution of the problem of the cities, of crime control, of equalizing opportunities of the disadvantaged, and of combating poverty, is to find reasonable evidence that the passage of the surcharge-expenditure-cut package will, in fact, accomplish its stated objectives. Will it curb excessive inflation, reduce interest rates, and restore a favorable trade balance? It will not do so if what we save from the domestic program is to be shunted into the war machine in Vietnam. We might as well be straightforward about it: Our deficit is now approximately \$30 billion. This is almost exactly the same figure that is being spent in Vietnam in 1968.

I find it disheartening that we are now called on to pass legislation raising taxes

by 10 percent and cutting expenditures by 3.2 percent while as recently as June 11, 1968, the House passed legislation increasing expenditures for the war in Vietnam by \$6.1 billion or 24 percent of the previous 1968 war appropriations.

If a government is to be trusted, it must be candid with the governed. I do not find that candor in the Vietnam budget for 1969, \$25.7 billion. Let me point out why. The following figures show Vietnam expenditures from 1965 through 1968 and troop development from 1965 through 1969:

EXPENDITURES¹ AND TROOP DEPLOYMENT IN VIETNAM

	Amount	Number
1965	\$0.1	184,000
1966	5.8	385,000
1967	20.1	486,000
1968	230.6	533,000
1969		450,000

¹ In billions of dollars.

² Estimate including supplemental appropriation of \$3,800,000,000 and a release from reserves created by Public Law 90-218 of \$2,300,000,000.

³ As of June 8.

⁴ Authorized.

A calculation of the ratio of dollars per man indicates that this figure is somewhat leveling out in 1967 and 1968, and using the 1968 figures, about \$57,400 per man is being expended. Therefore, we cannot anticipate a lower expenditure on Vietnam in 1969 than that of 1968. On the basis of troops to money ratio, we may estimate the expenditure at about \$31.4 billion in 1969, a further escalation. Therefore, it is quite likely, if these prognostications are reasonable, that our supplemental appropriations for Vietnam in 1969 will be about \$5.7 billion.

Last year Congress made cuts in new obligational authority of \$5.1 billion; and, by House Joint Resolution 888, placed \$6.1 billion in reserve and provided that it could not be spent without further affirmative action by Congress. The Republicans loudly proclaimed that these actions of Congress saved the taxpayers \$11.2 billion in 1967.

But in the second supplemental appropriations bill—the bill that pumped \$6.1 billion more into Vietnam—more than half of these “savings” were wiped out by the war expenditures alone, thus the war gobbled up savings derived in part from the cuts in the humane programs last year. Other supplemental appropriations absorbed most of the rest of the alleged “savings.”

Now we are called upon to follow the same course: to cut \$6 billion from our household, business, and humane programs. Again, from all reasonable prognostications, approximately this amount will again be drained off in war expenditures.

I have consistently voted for the appropriations necessary to support our troops abroad, and I cannot find it in my heart to do otherwise in the future. When the men are there and the expenses have been incurred and support must go on, both conscience and good sense concur in approving the expenditures. Thus, the only place where one can protest this continued escalation, this continued beefing up of the sinews of war—at a

time when we profess a desire to stabilize the situation looking toward a negotiated peace—is when fiscal policy is being determined as it is now.

I wish to point out to you that this is not merely a question of maintaining the status quo in military support. We continue to escalate in our capital investments in war potential. In the Appropriation Committee's report on the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act (H.R. 17734) there is included an item for “additional Southeast Asia requirements,” called “general increase in operational readiness.” This item is an example of what I am saying. When one checks the committee hearings on this item, he finds on page 743 that this item includes “the opening of five additional TNT production lines,” “three additional single base propellant lines,” and “plant modification to increase production capacity of certain types of ammunition.”

I do not mean to engage in carping criticism of the details of the defense effort. I have not done this on appropriations or supplemental appropriations bills providing military support in Vietnam. But what has become abundantly clear is that, in the aggregate, these items spell out a trend: While we tighten our belt on domestic expenditures, we take up the entire difference between a frugal domestic program and the farthest reach of our financial and productive capacity in expenditures on the war effort.

This means that whatever taxes I vote for, whatever other fiscal restraints I support, the net result will be the counteraction of all these fiscal restraints by war expenditures. What then have we gained in curbing inflation, reducing interest rates, and restoring confidence in the American dollar abroad? Nothing. But in the meantime, we will have enacted a policy in the Congress of the United States expressing the intent of this Nation to reduce its commitment to the crying social ills of our time. If we need to feed the undernourished by an expanded food stamp program, it will cost more money. If we need to hire more policemen, better trained and professionalized, it will cost money. If we need to afford jobs to those too poorly trained to get jobs now, it will cost money. If we need to continue our manpower program seeking to give training to the unemployed and underemployed, it will cost money.

But when we vote for this \$6 billion mandatory cut we deny the existence of needs which no man concerned about these problems can conscientiously deny.

I know that it is said by some that this cut is only window dressing, that it may be restored by deficiency appropriations next year, that it will satisfy the people that Congress is acting frugally at the time it is imposing a tax. Therefore, it is argued that one who believes in the humane programs should go along with the pretense, and the money will somehow be slipped into the humane programs when the tax is firmly established and the November elections are over. But I do not accept this rationale for two reasons:

First, it is a deception, and, second,

in being so, it tends to destroy the base of political validity from which any progressive program must be launched. The passage of the mandatory \$6 billion cut will depress appropriations for urban problems, for training manpower, for relieving slum conditions, for providing innovative crime control programs, for supporting the war on poverty, for building low-cost housing, for expanding the food stamp program, and for supplementing the rent of the poor. I realize that we may not necessarily appropriate the funds adequately to finance these humane programs anyway. But I cannot honestly say, by supporting this bill, that \$6 billion can be pared from our national budget and that at the same time we can finance these programs which constitute the crying needs of the Nation at home.

We face possible economic chaos in the near future if we fail somehow to restrain the growing financial strains. The 10-percent surtax proposal was a good, feasible weapon in our fight against rising prices and interest rates. President Johnson was right in proposing it. It was wrong to attach a condition to its acceptance, and the \$6 billion cut was an almost back-breaking load. But when fiscal restraint is completely wiped out by war costs, the burden is indeed intolerable. For these reasons I will vote against the tax bill.

WASHINGTON MONUMENT, MOUNT VERNON PLAZA, BALTIMORE, 1968, CHARITY PROJECT

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud of the Baltimore Chapter Painting and Decorating Contractors of America. This firm volunteered to clean the Washington Monument in Mount Vernon Place, Baltimore, as its 1968 charity project. It is estimated the cleaning of the monument represents a \$10,000 value to the city of Baltimore.

In addition to this charity endeavor, and in the hope their efforts may do much to encourage citizens to clean up their own houses or places of business this summer, the Baltimore Chapter Painting and Decorating Contractors of America have also volunteered to paint the exterior of the Peale Museum, the Maryland Historical Society building, the Druid Hill Avenue YMCA and the Mental Health Association building.

The aforementioned buildings were completed on the day begun, June 17. The Washington Monument job, which will take a little longer, will be completed on Friday, June 21.

During such times as these, I feel the inspiring and worthwhile efforts on the part of the Baltimore Chapter Painting and Decorating Contractors of America are deserving of special recognition and for this reason I am bringing their deeds to the attention of the House. In doing

what they have done for charity and for the welfare of the city of Baltimore, this firm personifies the finest sentiments of our society.

THE NONPROLIFERATION TREATY: ANOTHER LETTER TO SANTA CLAUS?

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the respected Wall Street Journal has sounded one of the few notes of sanity from the press concerning the proposed non-proliferation treaty, which is now before the United Nations.

Nonproliferation is, we are told daily, akin to motherhood, the flag, apple pie, and Sandy Koufax, and to criticize it borders on heresy. But amid the exuberance of the President, the Nation and the press over recent events at the United Nations concerning the NPT, the Wall Street Journal compared it to the famed Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928, which was supposed to outlaw war.

In an editorial in its June 16 edition, the Journal recalls that one "wag" referred to the Kellogg-Briand Pact as a "letter to Santa Claus." And after having spent years trying to inform the Members of Congress, the public and the press that the nonproliferation treaty was not only useless but possibly dangerous as well, I can appreciate WSJ's reference to it as just another letter to Santa Claus, an exercise in wishful thinking.

The editorial follows:

THE REALITIES OF NONPROLIFERATION

Irony tinged the celebration of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty the United Nations approved last week. For while the treaty seems sensible enough in a small way, its underlying meaning is rather the opposite of what the celebrants like to believe.

With characteristic overstatement of small accomplishments, President Johnson commended the treaty as a "momentous event," an "instrument of international peace and sanity," and a "testament to the reason and to the will of mankind to endure." This estimate has been widely echoed. One newspaper of some note ballyhooed the approval as an action that "turned back the doomsday clock."

All of which brings to mind the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928, a magnificent document outlawing war. The treaty was approved by practically all nations of the world, ratified by a vote of 85 to 1 in the U.S. Senate and won a Nobel Peace Prize for Secretary of State Frank Kellogg. As subsequent events proved, however, the more sober evaluation was levied by one wag who dismissed it as "a letter to Santa Claus."

The naive 1928 pact and the current wide-eyed celebration of non-proliferation are the product of the same trap—confusing wish with reality. We can all wish that the nations of the world would agree to be ruled by law and sanity, that negotiation of a treaty would automatically create an enforceable and meaningful contract. But it is dangerous to dream that merely producing another treaty brings that millennium to pass.

The meaning of international treaties, rather, remains largely symbolic. We are not among those who scorn symbols as utterly

meaningless. Within a nation debating whether it needs nuclear arms, conceivably the formalities of a UN treaty could bolster somewhat the arguments and determination of groups opposed to building them. Obviously, though, no mere symbol will deter a nation really determined to build nuclear weapons, as the present treaty recognizes by allowing any nation to renounce it on three months' notice.

If a treaty is to have more than symbolic meaning, it must come not from the words of the provisions but from the underlying political realities. In the case of the non-proliferation pact, the underlying reality is not a new outburst of sanity but the hard fact of the American nuclear umbrella. The essential deal is quite simple: If nations not possessing nuclear weapons agree to refrain from developing such arms, the United States will agree to protect them from nuclear attack even at the risk of its own destruction.

The words of the treaty, of course, pledge the Soviet Union to join in protecting the non-nuclear states from nuclear attack. Yet we very much doubt the Soviet promise will influence decisions on nuclear weapons in key nations like India or West Germany, neither of which has committed itself to the pact. Their eventual decisions will depend on whether or not they find the American guarantee a credible one.

It is doubly ironic, then, that many of the voices most loudly warning against American overcommitment are the same ones most loudly celebrating the non-proliferation treaty. Not by any means that we dispute the dangers of overcommitment. Nor that we dispute that the American pledges formalized by the treaty actually represent little change from long-standing policy. It's merely that the tone of celebration belies the life-and-death American commitments at the heart of the international agreement.

The non-proliferation treaty does not signal the dawn of a civilized world order to spare America the agonies of military force and power-balance diplomacy. Instead, it reaffirms that for the foreseeable future, peace in the world will depend no little on how wisely America can wield its huge national power.

CONGRESS SHOULD TAKE SECOND LOOK AT CRIME

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last week I and a group of colleagues requested that the President consider a veto of the so-called omnibus anticrime bill. This legislation, passed in great haste and in a moment of hysteria, is a blot on the legislative history of the American Congress. I hope the President will veto this bill.

In the meanwhile, the San Antonio Express has written a very good editorial in connection with this ill-advised legislation. I offer it to my colleagues:

CONGRESS SHOULD TAKE SECOND LOOK AT CRIME

The anti-crime bill passed by the Senate a couple of weeks ago and by the House last week has clearly unconstitutional features in it.

The Senate loaded it with amendments to express its displeasure with certain Supreme Court decisions on criminal procedure. Among the amendments are restrictions on the

court, which anyone should know are without force because our government is organized into three independent branches, of which the court is one.

The constitution is changed by vote of the people, not of the Congress. Despite opinion that the court has legislated through its opinions, it is the legally-empowered agency that interprets the law.

When the House passed the Senate bill, instead of sending it to conference, it was acting in an emotional protest against the assassination of Senator Kennedy. The President should send the bill back for more sober consideration in both houses.

THE ORDINARY MEN AND WOMEN ARE AMERICA'S SAVING GRACE

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing a young man, Carl R. Terzian, whose contributions to his community and his Nation have been so outstanding that he has received recognition on not only a national level but also as a representative of the United States in many areas of the globe. One of his more recent honors is a Freedoms Foundation Award. Upon returning to California from Valley Forge, Pa., Mr. Terzian contributed a guest editorial to the Santa Monica Evening Outlook. I believe Mr. Terzian's eloquent tribute to America's "ordinary men and women" is worthy of the attention of every Member of this House.

Mr. Terzian's comments follow:

A NECESSARY REMINDER: THE ORDINARY MEN AND WOMEN ARE AMERICA'S SAVING GRACE (By Carl R. Terzian)

I have recently returned from Valley Forge, Penna., where, along with several other Americans, I was privileged to accept a Freedoms Foundation Award. But far more than my cash prize and honor medal, I will forever remember the striking contrast between what most citizens are accomplishing in defense of our own way of life—often without public notice—and the disgusting actions of a well-publicized few that try to degrade or even destroy the tenets of our greatness.

We are constantly expected, for example, to stomach the "sick tirades" of Rap Brown, Stokely Carmichael and Adam Clayton Powell; or to applaud Negro athletes who refuse to compete. But as an American—black or white—you would have been proud to sit with me at Valley Forge and cheer a Negro colonel who has led his Air Force wing on more than 100 missions over North Vietnam. Col. Daniel James, who received most of his education from his mother—as the youngest of 17 children—frequently and eloquently justifies his country's commitments overseas.

Some of our Hollywood personalities are crushing one another in the mad rush to see who can hog the most headlines in their new self-imposed roles as "enlightened" foreign policy critics. Yet, with little fanfare, tireless Martha Raye was honored "for her mirthful spirit and enthusiastic support of our armed forces on the battlefield, on ships at sea, and in hospitals."

A small handful of the clergy is today preoccupied with marches, politics, forming unions and opening the church as a sanctuary for draft-dodgers. But most parish priests—whose efforts generally go unher-

alded—are deeply committed to their faith and fatherland. Scores of them were recognized at Valley Forge—men like Father John F. Sammon, of Tustin, who one Sunday last year proclaimed from the pulpit: "Unless we ourselves seriously believe the principles of the Declaration of Independence, America will be no safer today than it was at those early hours when the patriots formed to defend what they considered a great idea, their Country."

Our urban streets are crowded with bearded cowards and fairy-like peaceniks who generously denounce for the sake of undeserved publicity. Responsible parents, however, can be proud of award recipients like Mark White, flown in from combat, to be thanked for simple—but moving—sentiments, like:

"I know I'm young, too young even to vote for my ultimate commander-in-chief, but, Mom, how old must a guy be before he can realize the importance of freedom, patriotism and trust? It's not an Army of youth-blinded teenagers but rather a force body of men, striving for what we believe in and wish to perpetuate for our future wives and children."

And there are some among us who take sinister delight in deliberately amplifying the dishonest or erroneous behavior of a few public officials, thus casting a dark cloud over all who serve in government.

Where were these critics when the State Department's Frank Mrkva was voted the Freedoms Foundation's highest tribute, for "his courageous and selfless sacrifice for the safety of our nation while placing himself and his family in imminent danger through four years of undercover work thwarting conspiratorial communism's espionage plans in the department?"

Now, if you failed to read about these and other honest acts of patriotism, initiated by thousands of your fellow entertainers, housewives, ministers, police officers, politicians, reporters, teachers, merchants and classmates, it was probably because some editor thought that they were "too ordinary to be newsworthy."

Perhaps he was right.

But occasionally it is necessary to be reminded that ordinary men and women who perform ordinary deeds . . . are America's saving grace.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF TWO HUNGARIAN FREEDOM FIGHTERS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this week, and more precisely on June 17, commemorated the 10th anniversary of two Hungarian patriots. Imre Nagy and Gen. Pal Maleter, leaders of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution who were executed upon the orders of the Kremlin. The executions were dutifully carried out by the puppet government of Hungary.

I insert into the RECORD a resolution adopted here in Washington by the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation U.S.A., eulogizing these two great fighters for freedom.

The resolution follows:

HUNGARIAN FREEDOM FIGHTERS FEDERATION, U.S.A.

WASHINGTON, June 17, 1968.—On June 17, 1958, the Kremlin announced the execution of two Hungarians, the leaders of the 1956 revolution.

Imre Nagy, the prime minister, and General Pal Maleter, the defense minister of the coalition government, formed on November 3, 1956, were captured and murdered by agents of the Soviet Union. This act was committed in defiance of repeated assurance of personal safety and freedom for the two dedicated champions of self determination, human rights, liberty, and national independence.

We, members of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation, U.S.A., former comrades in arms of Imre Nagy and Pal Maleter, participants of the Hungarian Revolution, of the glorious, victorious and hopeful efforts to create an independent Hungary free of oppression, torture, suffering, and foreign occupation, today pay tribute to their memories. Their sacrifice was made not in vain. History already proved that.

When we pause to mourn the victims of ruthless murder, we rededicate ourselves to the cause for which they so bravely died.

We, on this day, as free men, citizens of our adopted country following the example of Imre Nagy, Pal Maleter and the many nameless in the tradition of scores of great Americans solemnly take the pledge not to cease our efforts to achieve a free Hungary in a really peaceful world and to maintain a strong America providing a shining example of liberty and justice for all.

Dr. ANDRAS POGANY, President.

IMPOSITION OF IMPORT QUOTAS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the recurring threat to impose import quotas or other barriers to our import trade concerns the business community in my district. This concern was expressed recently by Mr. J. Patrick Kittler, Minneapolis attorney, in testimony before the Ways and Means Committee. Speaking on behalf of the Greater Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Kittler concludes that—

Import quotas *ipso facto* are a gigantic step backward to protectionism and isolationism. We have not yet heard an argument in their favor which compels, or even justifies, their enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I share the views so forcefully expressed by Mr. Kittler. Because he makes such a clear case on behalf of Minnesota's continuing interest in expanding international trade.

Under unanimous consent I submit the statement for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OPPOSING THE IMPOSITION OF IMPORT QUOTAS PRESENTED BY J. PATRICK KITTLER ON BEHALF OF THE GREATER MINNEAPOLIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BEFORE THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Representatives: The Greater Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce, which represents 2,550 dues paying member firms and 100 individuals, has actively and continuously supported the trade policy of the United States of the past 20-25 years, the clear objectives of which have been to remove unnecessary trade barriers and to expand foreign trade. We are pleased that Congress has resisted the demands of special-interest groups seeking the passage of import quotas and has deferred action on all such measures as well as on

modifications of tariffs and on the erection of other nontariff trade barriers until these hearings could be held, and we appreciate the opportunity to express our opposition today to the principles underlying the imposition of import quotas.

I. IMPORTANCE OF WORLD TRADE TO THE NATION AND MINNESOTA

Certainly among the most vital issues facing the nation today are the stability of the dollar, elevation of the standard of living among the economically depressed segments of our society and satisfactory resolution of the Viet Nam question. Even superficial analysis of these questions reveals that the internal and external economies of this country and our state are inextricably interwoven.

Fifty per cent of the national population is below the age of 25. More than 20% of the population consists of minority groups which form the economically depressed hard core. These two groups press upon the labor market, seeking 1.5 million new jobs each year.

Approximately 3,000,000 American jobs now depend directly on our export market. This market is growing twice as fast as our internal market and offers one of our best opportunities for expanded employment opportunities, since it adds approximately 1/2 million new jobs to the national community each year, or approximately 1/3 of the required job additions.

Numerous statistics could be cited to portray the importance of foreign trade to the development of business in Minnesota. Over 750 of approximately 5,000 firms engaged in manufacturing in Minnesota are directly involved in world trade. In 1967 \$333,000,000 of manufactured goods and \$257,000,000 of agricultural products were exported from Minnesota. Manufactured export products provided employment for at least 38,000 persons, and agricultural export products for 34,000 persons. 12.7% of Minnesota farm workers are directly dependent upon exports for their jobs. Exports of manufactured products have risen approximately 50% since 1963, and at this rate of growth will reach \$486,000,000 by 1970, creating 17,100 additional jobs in Minnesota. During fiscal 1965-1966 agricultural exports resulted in 1/3 of the State's total farm cash receipts. Looking to the future, Minnesota will require 27,000 new jobs annually. If exports are permitted to expand at their potential rate of growth, they can provide 1/3 of these jobs. The exports and foreign investments of business firms with headquarters in the Twin Cities area caused it to rank among the nation's ten largest metropolitan areas in initiating new foreign business activities during 1966.

Few figures are available as to Minnesota's role in imports, partly because many products enter through coastal seaports. However, with Duluth assuming an increasingly important role as a seaport and the Twin Cities also being a port of entry for substantial imports by air and shipments by inland waterways, it is clear that Minnesota trade area industries consume substantial imports. If import quotas have the intended effect, the economies of our port cities will be seriously affected.

Perhaps even more revealing than the compelling evidence as to the large portion of local industry involved in world trade is the fact that because world trade has so permeated every aspect of domestic business—by providing additional jobs and increasing profits—virtually unanimous support for a forward-looking trade policy is offered by firms which have no direct involvement in world trade at this time.

II. A SUCCESSFUL FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

We believe that the strength of America lies importantly in its demonstrated ability to compete successfully in a world market with as few artificial trade barriers as possible. One of the strongest forces of attraction to United States' leadership is its pre-

eminence in matters of business and technology. For at least 20 years the United States, through active espousal of the formation of common markets, free trade associations, universal monetary and political cooperation, multinational rationalization of commodities markets, and prodigious public investment in the economic infrastructure of disabled or under-developed nations, has offered the world its forward-looking leadership based on the philosophy that United States prosperity is unavoidably tied to the prosperity of the world community. America has been taken at its word. Its leadership has been accepted. The ideals which it has preached—of free markets, open economies and non-abuse of right—have become the standard for criticism of national economic policies. Indeed, where American trade policy has been criticized, it is most often for failure to live up to the standards which America itself has established.

One need only look to the cause of the fantasia of restrictive trade legislation to recognize the success of our foreign economic policy. Nations of Europe and Asia, which for years following World War II were supported on the public dole of the United States, are now successfully competing in world markets and forming common markets and economic development associations of their own. Books, newsletters and commentators' columns abound on the specifics of these phenomena. Our own Department of Commerce produces volumes of statistics annually which convincingly reveal the success of this policy. The continuation of this policy has been marked dramatically by the successful conclusion of the Kennedy Round, regarded by many well-informed foreign traders as the most significant step forward in trade liberalization in history.

III. PROPOSED IMPORT QUOTAS

Distressingly, in the face of the overwhelming evidence as to the importance of world trade to our economy, and despite our historically successful foreign economic policy, a flood of legislation has been proposed requesting import quotas on the goods of those who by exporting to us provide us with the opportunity to export. Proposals for import quotas are not novel. In fact, we had hoped they were obsolete, for almost 20 years have elapsed since the United States, in cooperation with other countries, was instrumental in abolishing the great majority of import quotas then existing throughout the world. Following World War II the United States played a dominant role in convincing the war-torn countries of Europe to pursue the reconstruction of their economies without resorting for the most part to import quotas. But now, virtually in the wake of the Kennedy Round, what we urged the disadvantaged nations to do without, we are considering doing ourselves. We cannot afford to lose our perspective in the face of such an unprecedented and, one cannot help but think, opportunistic, onslaught of protectionism. The myriad of products affected by the proposed import quota bills account for some 6.7 billion, or 42% of United States imports.

IV. ARGUMENTS AGAINST IMPORT QUOTAS

What, then, would be the consequences of imposing import quotas? The arguments against such quotas are numerous and compelling. They inevitably lead to increased inflation at a time when the President has stated that "passage of the anti-inflation tax is the most critical action we could take now to strengthen our position at home and in world markets" and the Congress has insisted that public budget reduction is equally important. Moreover, as emphasized in the 1968 Report of the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee and by the Administration, they inevitably lead to reduced exports at a time when export expansion is essential to the security of the dollar. We have re-

ceived repeated clear warnings from our overseas trading partners that they will be unable to buy United States goods if the United States is unwilling to buy theirs. These warnings may not always seem credible to us. However, we need only recall that within 12 months after the Smoot Hawley Tariff of 1932 United States exports declined by 50%. Presumably, some comparable result would follow the present enactment of import quotas, thus potentially reducing export sales of United States products by as much as \$15 billion per year in the industries affected. Therefore, the imposition of import quotas would jeopardize further our balance of trade and balance of payments rather than contributing to the solution of those critical problems.

Import quotas would also limit sources of supply of United States manufacturers, restrict the consumer's choice and, in general, serve the special interests of a relative few without contributing positively to the trade policy of the nation as a whole.

In view of the regressive effect of import quotas upon world trade and the serious disadvantages to our country inherent in their enactment, one would expect their advocates to present undeniable proof of the benefits which they would assure and to propose a legislative plan with a broader view of the economy. Yet we are unaware of even one substantial valid justification for their passage. They will not aid in solving the balance-of-payments problem. They have not been shown to be necessary for reasons of national security, and other procedures already exist to assure that national security is given uppermost consideration in the formulation and development of United States trade policy. They certainly do not seem to offer advantages either to the American working man, who will find fewer jobs available, the American businessman, whose profits as well as markets are likely to be reduced, or the American consumer, who will be required to pay increased prices as a result of decreased competition. If they are needed because certain United States industries no longer enjoy a sufficient comparative advantage to be competitive in world markets, means may already be available through Adjustment Assistance or otherwise to enable such industries to phase out of their existing areas of operation, or at least to diversify sufficiently to continue on a profitable basis. Certainly, the principles of free enterprise and competition, which may have been the single most important factors in the growth of technology and industry in the United States, have not become so valueless that government controls must be imposed primarily to protect United States industries which are no longer competitive. Perhaps the acid test of the efficacy of import quotas is simply to take a hard look at those who support them and to determine whether any substantial support comes from groups without a special economic interest to be served by one or more quota bills.

But the effects of import quotas on America and Americans alone cannot be the decisive basis for acting upon them. At this point in history, we cannot permit ourselves to be so provincial as to be motivated in matters so intertwined with world prosperity solely by their effect upon Minnesotans, or even upon all Americans. The United States enjoys the privilege and is faced with the responsibility of taking a larger view.

Now is the time when American leadership will be demonstrated. The question is simply in which direction it will proceed. In the direction of the past 20 years? Or in the direction of 35 years ago, when protectionism and isolationism carried the day? We are not faced with the burden of bearing this responsibility alone, for 16 highly industrialized nations representing populations of approximately 400,000,000 people have come forward with a proposal which clearly reveals a con-

cern on their part for the current balance-of-payments problems of the United States and at the same time a recognition of their dependence on responsible leadership from the United States. Unilaterally, they have offered the United States an opportunity to defer implementation of the tariff reductions of the Kennedy Round while simultaneously accelerating their own tariff reductions. Can America's response reasonably be the imposition of import quotas, which in the view of Ambassador William M. Roth, the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, would, "in effect be repealing the rule of law in international trade," and would place us "on the road to undermining the very foundations of GATT"? The repercussions of such a response would not only be economic. The conditions of mutual respect and trust among nations created by our past foreign economic policies could well be eroded and, because foreign policy of nations depends in large measure on economic ties, realignment of loyalties on critical issues could be expected.

V. CONSIDERATION OF THE OVERALL PROBLEM

It cannot be denied that serious problems do presently face this nation. Some of them are far reaching and require the application of technical expertise, intelligence and statesmanship. However, the solutions should be commensurate to the problems, and the problems for which import quotas are being sought do not require such drastic measures. They are problems of adjustment and the tools for solving these problems already lie well within our grasp.

Even if Congress should decide that valid reasons do exist for benefitting the relative few with special interests at stake by closing our borders to foreign suppliers, it would seem imperative also to consider other actions to off-set the necessary economic effect of that restrictive policy. Generally, the exporters who will find their market opportunities foreclosed by the counter-measure of foreign governments will not also be the recipients of the benefits of the import quotas. If Congress can reasonably determine that a benefit will inure to the overall economy from restrictive trade legislation, it should provide for the adjustment assistance which will make it possible for those who lose jobs and markets to make the transition to an internally oriented economy. This would include not only the primary producers of export goods, but the producers and suppliers of goods and services which support primary production and move it to the foreign market. We understand that there are three such supporting individuals for every primary producer. The problem will be national in scope, as workers seek not only retraining but relocation into those areas which presumably will prosper as a result of market protection and away from the areas which will become economically depressed by the loss of export markets.

Those companies which can no longer serve foreign markets through export will naturally find it necessary to protect from loss their now substantial investments in foreign marketing facilities. This will require the creation of production facilities within what now are export markets. Responsible legislative action would require appropriate adjustment assistance, including the availability of necessary capital funds for investment abroad, and measures to neutralize the effect of such possible actions of foreign governments as the establishment of import quotas of their own, perhaps affecting products whose prospects for export growth from the United States are the greatest, the imposition of investment restrictions, the continuation of border taxes which U.S. businesses have so vehemently opposed for many years, restriction of financing available to companies with foreign ownership and other means aimed especially at United States industries.

VI. CONCLUSION

Import quotas ipso facto are a gigantic step backward to protectionism and isolationism. We have not yet heard an argument in their favor which compels, or even justifies, their enactment. But in our opinion they should not even be seriously considered except in the context of the larger problems affecting this country's economy. Surely the relationship of such quotas to the foreign investment restrictions recently imposed by executive order must be considered. Surely, the other available means for solving the problems which motivate various industries to seek such quotas must be considered. Surely the basic objectives of future United States foreign economic policy must be formulated. Surely, if any significant digressions from the foreign trade and economic policies of the United States over the past 25 years are necessary, they should be taken only after a searching, prolonged analysis of all facets of the problems and not at the behest of special interests or in the form of compromise riders or amendments to unrelated legislation. We understand that concurrently with these hearings an intensive study of these policies is being undertaken by the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations. The future of our foreign trade—the future of all foreign trade—now lies largely in the hands of Congress. We shall all await a decision commensurate with the magnitude of the issues.

A COMMON BOND

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, among the thousands of requests that have come to my office for effective gun-control legislation, something I strongly support, was a poignant essay by a constituent of mine. This lady, Mrs. Luella Sude Smith-eimer of Port Washington, N.Y., has known first hand the tragic consequences of easy access to arms and ammunitions.

I commend this essay to my colleagues' attention, as it is a most sincere and human plea for gun controls. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the essay in the RECORD at this point:

JUNE, 1968.

Is it possible that there could be a common bond between a nine year old Manhasset, Long Island boy and the Kennedy brothers—or the same nine year old child and Martin Luther King? Yes, the thread of equality was demonstrated in the means of death for all four victims. Each short-lived life was ended senselessly, cruelly, incredibly in exactly the same manner—with a destructive bullet. When the nine year old boy died, Jack Kennedy, his brother Robert and Martin Luther King were well into their teens and beyond. Although the Kennedy brothers and Martin Luther King were able to live long enough to make their mark in the world, the nine year old was struck down long before he was able to gain a semblance of maturity.

That boy, that nine year old child, died twenty-five years ago. His exact date of death was March 6th, 1943, ten days before his tenth birthday. The fatal instrument a .22 caliber rifle, placed in the hands of an eleven year old boy. A .22 caliber rifle with the supposedly secure safety precaution of a safety lock which was thought to be snapped into place. The wound in the child's forehead

was inflicted by a .22 caliber bullet—from a gun which was to have no bullets. The rifle belonged to the eleven year old boy. His father, a gun hobbyist, collected rifles. The father seeing no wrong in his son developing a similar hobby permitted his son to emulate him by providing him with a few rifles. The father recognizing that he had provided a lethal weapon, would not, however, allow the boy to have bullets.

How then was it possible for a child to be killed by a .22 caliber bullet? The eleven year old boy was determined to experiment with his new toy. He was industrious and managed to find an unscrupulous owner of a gun store in an adjoining community who was willing to sell him the bullets. Therefore, unknown to his parents, the eleven year old child was in possession of lethal bullets. The victim of the accidental or experimental(?) killing never regained consciousness. He died in his father's arms in the hospital ambulance. The unwitting child assassin unknowingly prayed for his friend's recovery: "If only he will be alright, I will give him all my comic books!"

Twenty years later on November, 1963, President John Kennedy was slain by rifle bullets and five years later both Senator Robert Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King were felled by assassins' bullets. How many more lives were lost as the result of non-existent gun laws during the intervening twenty-five years? Bob Considine, newspaper columnist, quoting Carl Bakal's book "The Right to Bear Arms" wrote: "Since the assassination of President Kennedy, more than 80,000 have been killed in this country by firearms, via homicide, accident and suicide. Firearms deaths now amount to 20,000 a year—on a par with the casualties we have suffered during the entire span of the war in Viet Nam."

Harold W. Glassen, president of the National Rifle Association, in opposition to pending gun control legislation stated this week: "Today, we are witnessing an almost unbelievable phenomenon in America. We see Americans behaving like children, parroting nonsense, accepting unproved theory as fact. . . ."

I ask you, is the death of a nine year old child by rifle bullets unproved? No, I can personally vouch for that fact . . . since the dead child was my brother. I do agree with Mr. Glassen that America is witnessing an unbelievable phenomenon. Something I never thought I would see. Americans have finally become adult enough to realize that those opposing strong gun control laws are actually destructionists. They revel in guns, idolize and cuddle guns. They claim to be hunters and sportsmen, people from every walk of society . . . but basically they are killers. They are the takers of lives, whether those lives be animal, fowl or human. The members of the NRA bear firearms for one purpose and one purpose alone—to take lives.

For years, I have been told I was foolish, unreasonable, and ridiculous because I cringed whenever someone presented my sons with toy pistols, rifles, B-B-guns and the like. Members of rifle clubs and gun societies have indicated that guns are absolutely safe if people are taught to handle them properly. Throughout the years, I have watched and listened while those around me were brainwashed into believing this NRA nonsense. Most people are indifferent, but experience had taught me the hard way. Firearms are lethal weapons. Owning one makes the owner a potential killer, and that person's home a potential death-trap. I firmly believe that these weapons of destruction should be virtually eliminated from the American scene. The time has come to stop glorifying the gun and the rifle.

Sincerely,

Mrs. LUELLA SUDE SMITHEIMER.
PORT WASHINGTON, N.Y.

CONSTITUENT'S VIEWS

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. William Graf, professor of biology at San Jose State College, and one of my constituents, has recently written me, asking that I bring his views to the attention of all Members of Congress.

Dr. Graf was born in Russia and, as he states in the letter addressed to me which transmitted his view:

The observations voiced strike the harder because I am a foreign born citizen and because I value so much what I have here. As a responsible citizen I cannot sit by and view the deterioration of my country without doing something to halt this trend.

Mr. Speaker, the views of such a man are worthy of consideration at all levels of our Government. I therefore submit Dr. Graf's letter without further comment so that the full impact of his words can be measured by all those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

SAN JOSE STATE COLLEGE,

San Jose, Calif., June 10, 1968.

TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Capitol Building,
Washington, D.C.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The trend of events and the philosophy and action demonstrated by many of the leaders of our country during the past few years has greatly disturbed me and has raised grave questions of doubt and concern in my mind over the motives of those who lead this country.

There is reason to ask whether this form of government can survive when we profess to fight a war to stop communism abroad but do nothing to stop it at home, and in fact actually encourage it by our disregard of its menace.

When the President and other leaders of our states and cities express great concern over the increasing crime rate but say nothing about the fact that a major part of that crime rate is due to repeaters, third and fourth time repeaters. Instead the President and leading law makers agitate constantly to pass laws against firearms use which is only a symptom of the crime and which will affect only the lawabiding firearms user—not the criminal.

When the President and leading senators and congressmen and other leaders in our country make no mention of the communist organizers who are behind the rioting, violence, looting, and arson in our cities and on our campuses.

When almost no mention is made by these men or those who dispense the news of the larger than life-size picture of Karl Marx and the Red flag that dominated the building that was taken over by the rioters on the Columbia University campus—or the statement made over the air by that notorious communist labor leader, Gus Hall, that he saw nothing wrong with the looting and arson in these riots.

When we make a hero of a man who professed peace, but whose actions and activities left a trail of riots and violence as a matter of rule rather than exception wherever he appeared.

When there is constant inference that we are a people of violence and hate and when such statements are quoted in the Russian press.

When Negro hate mongers are allowed to appear on national television networks and

openly proclaim that they will kill white people and that they are against the United States.

When much of the news media fails to uncover this picture or obviously covers it up, and when leading newspapers present distorted pictures of our way of life and are quoted in *Izvestia*.

When the Supreme Court constantly makes it easier for communists to operate in this country and makes it easier for the criminal to escape justice.

And finally, when all this is added up and looked at as a total picture, there is reason to ask, who among our leaders is trying to subvert the Constitution of the United States and who is trying to change our government to a totalitarian communist form of rule.

Is the government in its lack of action against crime and against the looting and burning during the riots and in its condoning of threats of violence against the public and its defiance of the United States by a minority group trying to create a state of emergency by the disruption of civil law and order, by creating fear among the people so that it can impose dictatorial control under guise of emergency measures and thereby usher in communism in its final form?

Is the frantic effort to register the guns in the hands of the law-abiding citizen the last link in the chain—the need to disarm the public before communism can take over. Disarmament of the public is always the final symptom of pending dictatorship. Is someone afraid of the loyal law abiding American?

What I have presented here is FACT—it has happened and is happening daily. I ask only that you give serious thought to what I have said and that you do not pass lightly over this matter.

I am not the only one who is concerned over these matters. More and more people are expressing concern and more and more are heard to say that they will not submit to further curtailment of their personal rights to protect themselves from those who openly threaten them. These are the seeds of revolt and civil war.

As a foreign born citizen I appreciate more than any native born American the privileges and advantages of my country. I want to preserve this country as it was conceived and to protect that which makes it unique in the world—a free country.

I was born in Russia, and the symptoms I see are all too familiar and the more a concern to me.

I am sure that the majority of you are sincere and loyal Americans and are trying to do your job to the best of your ability, and I hope that you will consider this matter one of as great a concern to you as it is to me.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM GRAF, Ph. D.,
Department of Biology.

GONZALEZ TESTIFIES ON WAR PROFITS AND THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the testimony I submitted yesterday to the hearings of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency relative to amending the Defense Production Act:

STATEMENT OF HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ, A U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM TEXAS, BEFORE THE SENATE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE ON AMENDMENTS TO THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity to testify before your distinguished committee on S. 3097, to renew the Defense Production Act. As a sponsor with Chairman Wright Patman of H.R. 17268, which amended the DPA to institute uniform accounting standards for all negotiated contracts and subcontracts in excess of \$100,000 upon development and promulgation of such standards by the Comptroller General, I strongly endorse the Proxmire amendment to S. 3097 which has a similar intent. The Proxmire amendment contains a refinement to H.R. 17268 as introduced, to the effect that uniform accounting standards would become mandatory upon development unless the Comptroller General determined that the cost to the government of implementing such standards exceeds the potential benefit to the government arising from their use. I also support this improvement of Senator Proxmire.

As you know, in a close vote in committee, H.R. 17268 was weakened by declaring that uniform accounting standards be developed by the Comptroller General, but only recommended back to Congress. This course was accepted by the House as a whole on June 4 after spirited debate.

I do not agree with this course. I believe that further delay in facing the issue of excessive profits on war contracts is unconscionable. Admiral Hyman Rickover, whose testimony led to the introduction of H.R. 17268, told our House hearings that "the lack of uniform accounting is the most serious deficiency in Government procurement today." He testified that savings with uniform pricing standards could easily be \$2 billion a year.

The Defense Production Act establishes a system to provide, among other things, for price stabilization of goods and services necessary for the national security. Specifically, Section 707 states that no person shall discriminate against priority defense orders "by charging higher prices or by imposing different terms and conditions for such orders or contracts than for other generally comparable orders or contracts, or in any other manner." As a result of my two-year study and intense concern with war profiteering, I believe that uniform accounting standards are vitally needed to implement the Defense Production Act.

EXCESSIVE PROFITS

It is clear that higher prices are being charged for defense material, discriminating against other demands on the taxpayer's defense dollar. It is also clear that profits are increasing as a result of Vietnam procurement. Some persons persist in quoting the L.M.I. report to the effect that defense profits are declining. This is nonsense. A numbers racket is being perpetrated: representatives of defense contractors tell us of low profits, but the Wall Street reports of most corporations with heavy defense work show net income and dividends up sharply. All authoritative studies, including the one in the L.M.I. report, show profits on defense work for Vietnam increasing. I will not belabor the point, for I have commented on it at length on several occasions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The reason there is room for any debate on whether defense profits are rising to scandalous proportions or not is that no one has comprehensive information about defense costs and profits. In fiscal 1967, 56.7% of all contracts were firm-fixed-price. Whether negotiated or "competitive", the Department of Defense does not pretend to know what costs were actually incurred and what profits were actually realized on these contracts.

Even on the minority of contracts in which DOD theoretically retained an interest in realized costs, these figures are suspect because of the wide latitude in accounting methods allowed contractors, and the loose definitions of costs.

The special Hardy investigating subcommittee reported to us in February that "deficiencies continue to persist in the contractor's submission of cost data and in the Government's review of negotiation data." A Joint Economic subcommittee reported to us in April "of loose and flagrantly negligent management practices in the Defense procurement program" with DOD "only timidly, at best, implementing the Truth in Negotiations Act passed 5 years ago." The fact that such substantial and documented reports are so easily negated and ignored indicates that no amount of examples of laxity in administering existing law and regulation will greatly stir DOD nor Congress, nor restrain industry. Uniform accounting standards offer the best hope. If standards were implemented and reports of defense profits made to Congress, we would learn for the first time what it costs to produce those defense contracts over \$100,000; we would have a basis for comparing the performance of different contractors and different types of contracts; and we would also and finally have definitive comprehensive data on what the level of defense profits and whether or at what rate they increase.

All we can be certain of now is how much we are paying for defense goods. This is due to the overriding acceptance in defense procurement of the notion of basing cost and profit data on "generally accepted accounting principles." This notion is pervasive in the Renegotiation Act, and widespread in the Truth in Negotiations Act and in the Armed Services Procurement Regulations. DOD's excessive reliance on "generally accepted accounting principles" means in effect that a defense contractor can choose any of a wide variety of complex accounting schemes. Contractors bent on bilking the government, or bent simply upon retaining a windfall profit, find it easy to misstate costs and hide profits through accounting.

As Admiral Rickover testified: "Profit is only a part of the real income to a company. In many cases the company benefits through overhead as well as from profit—sometimes better, since profits are taxed and overhead is not. Overhead charges usually constitute a great part of the cost on Government contracts. It is here that companies use much ingenuity in making expenditures for plant repairs and rearrangements, tools, manufacturing control techniques, computer programs and other items—items which can be charged to overhead by which actually serve to improve the company's commercial capability...."

"It should be clearly understood that under existing procurement rules it is not possible to tell just how much it costs to manufacture equipment or just how much profit a company actually makes—without spending months reconstructing the supplier's books. Large additional profits can easily be hidden just by the way overhead is charged, how component parts are priced, or how intracompany profits are handled. The company may report as cost what actually is profit.... Thus, profit statistics are meaningless unless measured in accordance with a uniform standard."

THE PRACTICALITY OF UNIFORM ACCOUNTING STANDARDS

Development of uniform accounting standards is by no means impossible. Statements to this effect are reminiscent of the debate over establishing the income tax, when it was argued that no bureaucrat could design a reporting form that all citizens could understand, that the privacy of private citizens was invaded and that competitive secrets of

business would be disclosed. But a start was made, and most fears have proven unfounded.

I do not envision uniform accounting standards as becoming a monolithic, revolutionary system perpetrated on defense contractors. The need is limited to a reasonable uniformity in those cost factors which are significant and applicable for defense procurement. A single accounting system is not what's desired, but greater uniformity in cost standards. The GAO would not weave these standards out of whole cloth, but rather choose the cost accounting principles which best suits our right to accurate cost and profit data on government spending.

Section XV of the Armed Services Procurement Regulation (ASPR) is the obvious starting point for uniform cost standards. Compliance with ASPR cost definitions is mandatory for Cost Plus contracts, which constituted 21% of total defense procurement in fiscal 1967. For this type of contract, the implementation of comprehensive cost standards would just be an extension of current compliance requirements.

At present, ASPR is only a suggested guide for arriving at cost figures for the three types of Fixed Price Redeterminable contracts— incentive, escalation and straight redeterminable, which constitute respectively 18%, 3%, and 2% of total defense procurement. Instead of cost standards being simply guidelines, I envision that uniform cost standards be made mandatory for these negotiated contracts.

The remaining group of defense contracts are Firm-Fixed-Price, which constituted 56% of the total in fiscal 1967. Firm Fixed Price contracts include competitively-bid contracts, contracts negotiated under the Truth-in-Negotiations Act, and contracts which the Government negotiator declares "competitive" enough to be exempt from the Truth Act. It is this latter, so-called "competitive" negotiated contract which was responsible for much of the abuse which the Hardy Subcommittee documented, concluding that "procurement files gave the appearance of having met all of the technical requirements of the Armed Services Procurement Regulation (ASPR) but, in fact, procurement personnel failed to apply common-sense to preclude the payment of exorbitant prices."

The temptation for government procurement officers to have their firm-fixed price contracts approved as "competitive" is not hard to understand, for this saves them time and aggravation. Once a FFP contract is negotiated, only the delivery remains. There is no procedure for post-award audit to check whether the procurement officer accepted a price list that was outdated, a catalog item that was commonly discounted, or whether the one or two bids were not otherwise seriously competitive. On the other hand, if the procurement officer cannot get the contract labeled competitive, he must prepare compliance with the Truth in Negotiations Act. This requires specific cost-data from the contractor, an auditor's review to determine if the submitted data is accurate, complete and current (which may take 60 to 90 days), after which a confrontation with the contractor would be necessary if the government auditor questions the submitted data. As Admiral Rickover characterizes it: "In these circumstances many procurements are improperly judged competitive, to the mutual advantage of both the contracting officer and the contractor, but at the great disadvantage to the Government."

Under uniform cost standards, I envision contractors with Firm Fixed Price contracts in excess of \$100,000 filing post-delivery reports, not for purposes of redetermining profits at all, but as a tool for government management to check the performance of the procurement system, to serve as a guide for future purchases of the same or similar

item, and to provide Congress with comprehensive data on the actual costs and profits of defense work. Post-delivery reports of actual costs based on uniform pricing standards would also be useful in identifying those contracts on which post-award audits under the Truth in Negotiations Act are indicated.

I envision Section XV of ASPR as the starting point for uniform cost standards. ASPR is largely concerned with defining those costs which shall be considered appropriate to government contracts. For example, bad debts, contributions and donations, entertainment costs are unallowable, as are most advertising, interest and idle facilities costs. An obvious way ASPR can be built upon to become applicable to all defense procurement is by defining how costs are to be allocated between several contracts being fulfilled simultaneously by a contractor. Nearly all contractors utilize cost accounting techniques to assign general and administrative costs, including overhead, among their products in progress. However, no such pricing data is currently required by DoD, despite flagrant examples of the government being charged for overhead or other development costs properly assignable to the contractor's commercial business.

COST OF UNIFORM PRICING STANDARDS

The argument is frequently heard that the cost to industry of complying with any pricing standards would be prohibitive. This has a vaguely familiar ring which I am sure the members of this committee will recall, for it was said about the Truth in Lending that it would be very expensive and difficult to bill customers by the true interest rate, although everyone was doing just that for misleading rates.

Under the Proxmire amendment, it is academic to speculate on the expense of instituting uniform cost standards. His amendment would properly instruct the Comptroller General to determine whether the benefits of uniform standards would outrun the cost of implementing them. We are all aware that the government will sooner or later, directly or indirectly, pay for the contractors' expense in complying-with-uniform cost standards. It is not my intention, nor that of anyone I know in Congress or government, to cut into the reasonable and conscientious profits of defense contractors. We all intend defense work to be profitable.

Congress has armed the GAO with auditing expertise, and the Proxmire amendment would designate GAO to evaluate whether uniform cost standards make fiscal sense. The GAO is the proper place for the resolution of this issue.

Personally, I believe Admiral Rickover's estimate is reasonable that savings of \$2 billion a year are possible with uniform cost standards. I suspect that even in the short run, with the circumscribed expansion of available pricing techniques which I envision, the government will save money upon implementing uniform standards. And the long run benefits may be even more substantial in providing a sound basis for pricing future purchases, as a tool to evaluate the effectiveness of procurement practices, and to provide a true picture of the costs of defense contracts and the profits realized on them.

CONGRESS AND THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

The Proxmire amendment, and H.R. 17268 as I introduced it, delegate to the General Accounting Office the technical task of implementing the Congressional policy that uniform cost standards are needed under the Defense Production Act.

Few Senators or Congressmen have been accountants. Nearly half a century ago, Congress established the General Accounting Office to assist in providing legislative control over public funds. Congress constantly reaffirms its reliance upon the highly trained and competent personnel of the GAO for the expertise to audit and evaluate the complex

accounting data required by present-day defense systems. GAO is directly responsible to Congress. It exists to carry out the audit and accounting technicalities of Congressional policy. This is precisely what the Proxmire amendment would have GAO do.

CONCLUSION

I do not see uniform accounting standards as a single, monolithic accounting system. I see pricing standards based on ASPR which would allow reasonable comparability of defense costs, and would provide hard data on actual defense costs and profits. I do not see the GAO imposing revolutionary accounting systems upon defense industries; I see their role as arbitrator, to choose which pricing techniques would best fulfill the responsibility of Congress to protect the taxpayer's defense dollar.

I do not pretend that the task before the Comptroller General under the pending amendment to the Defense Production Act is easy. I am aware that definitions of allowable depreciation costs have been always the subject of intense and diverse opinion among accountants, and I realize the difficulty in developing standards which will be equitable to the contractor with a minority of defense work as well as to the contractors who subsist on government contracts. But the task is by no means impossible; most of the components exist in current accounting practices.

The subject is complex, but the basic issue before this Committee and this Congress is simple. It is whether this Congress is going to be insensitive to a clearly established need or whether it will discharge its responsibility to adequately protect the American taxpayer against war profiteering. I cannot believe it will be considered a burden to develop standards of accountability that would give us accurate figures on defense costs and profits so the taxpayer can gauge whether he is getting the service or production rendered for his money. Congress cannot give a responsible or truthful accounting to the American people without action to safeguard the public till. I believe that the Proxmire amendment to the Defense Production Act is the most effective place to start.

I thank the Committee for this opportunity to testify.

THE RUSK FAMILY TEAM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, was the solidarity march by the Poor People's Campaign a State Department operation guided by the Ruskus?

While poor Daddy Rusk promotes bridgebuilding relations with Communist Russia, his son, young David Rusk, learns the trade in Washington, D.C.

Young David Rusk was pictured as deputy national coordinator for the solidarity march. Now, he has been promoted from the Washington Urban League to the Labor Department.

Meantime, the Human Relations Council of Washington, D.C., adopted a resolution proclaiming 1968 as Human Rights Year and all participated in the march. See my remarks in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 24, 1968, page 14988.

Real teamwork pulling America apart. Kinda Ruski.

I include several clippings from the Evening Star for June 13, 14, and 19 following my remarks:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 14, 1968]

RUSK SEES SOVIET AIDE AND THANT

NEW YORK—Secretary of State Dean Rusk yesterday lunched with the Soviet Union's deputy foreign minister, Vasily V. Kuznetsov. They reportedly discussed the new Berlin crisis.

Rusk spent about 30 minutes discussing "many things" with U.N. Secretary General Thant before driving to the Soviet mission and his luncheon date with Kuznetsov.

Rusk refused to discuss the subject of his talks with Thant, but he said they did not talk about Vietnam.

Rusk was accompanied on his visit to Thant's office by Arthur J. Goldberg, who is leaving as U.S. ambassador to the United Nations.

Rusk said Kuznetsov invited him to lunch in return for one Rusk held for the Soviet diplomat recently in Washington.

Diplomatic sources said the two men likely discussed the new Berlin crisis. East Germany has started imposing strict visa requirements on all road traffic between West Germany and West Berlin in a move to try to force the Bonn regime to recognize East Germany's communist regime.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 19, 1968]

Mayor Walter Washington (right) talks with David Rusk (left), son of Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and Everett Morgan, a marshal, at the Washington Monument grounds. Rusk is deputy national coordinator for today's Solidarity Day march. He has just resigned a post with the Washington Urban League to join the Labor Department. (Caption.)

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 19, 1968]

HUMAN RELATIONS PANEL BUDGET INCREASE BACKED (By Paul Delaney)

The Washington City Council last night tentatively approved a request for a \$549,000 amendment to the fiscal 1969 budget that includes \$334,000 to revamp the Human Relations Council.

The money for the District government's civil rights unit would finance 29 new positions.

The HRC now has eight employees and operated in fiscal 1968 on a budget of \$83,000. The original request for 1969 was for 14 additional staff members on a total budget of \$117,900.

The request by Mayor Walter E. Washington fulfills a promise he made when he took office last year to make the agency more effective. He has expanded and broadened HRC to 25 members, including youth representatives.

The action also was due to pressure exerted by members of the agency as well as community organizations. Several individuals and representatives of city organizations strongly supported HRC in testimony before the City Council. Included were Rufus (Catfish) Mayfield, the League of Women Voters, Frontiers International Club, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Status of Women.

TO SPUR TOURISM

The rest of the amended budget request, which the mayor said will come from the general fund, will finance a \$65,000 increase to the Washington Convention and Visitors Bureau to spur lagging tourism and \$150,000 for reclassification of 584 school custodian positions.

The council also gave tentative approval to a request from the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board to amend liquor regulations to permit extended payment, up to 12

months, by retailers to their wholesale creditors. This would apply only to those retail licensees affected by the riots.

As the law now reads, bills must be paid by the 15th of the following month. Liquor store owners have complained that they were unable to meet their financial obligations after the disturbances.

The council also gave first reading approval to an ABC request to discontinue citing and suspending those license holders unable to pay their debts by the second month. This would relieve the ABC Board of being a bill collector for wholesalers, Chairman Joy Simonson testified.

DEPENDS ON CONGRESS

The HRC request depends on whether Congress approves the already requested 14 new positions. Several HRC members sat in the audience as their chairman and vice chairman, Msgr. George Gingras and the Rev. David Eaton, noted the disrespect citizens have for HRC and the inability of the agency to do a good job because of inadequate staffing.

"Most of the council's work has been reacting instead of acting," Mr. Eaton stated. "If we can't find the staff, then we ought to be honest with ourselves and disband the council."

In adopting a resolution proclaiming 1968 as Human Rights Year, the council gave its approval to today's Solidarity Day March and noted that all nine of its members will participate in the march. Council also took the occasion to welcome the Poor People's Campaign to the city, declaring:

"We welcome to our city citizens from all over the land seeking an end to poverty, discrimination or other forms of injustice who come to exercise their rights to petition their government in an orderly manner."

OK GIVEN FOR MARCH ON JUNE 19

(By Paul Hathaway)

The federal government agreed yesterday to issue a permit for the Poor People's Solidarity Day program next Wednesday, including a march from the Washington Monument to the Lincoln Memorial.

Sterling Tucker, coordinator of the march which the Southern Christian Leadership Conference hopes will attract thousands of supporters, said the permit was cleared by the General Services Administration and the Park Service.

Metropolitan Police Chief John B. Layton today said that he has requested that D.C. National Guardsmen be put in service on the day of the march. During the April riots, some 1,800 Guardsmen were on duty and during the funeral of Sen. Robert F. Kennedy, 800 supplemented the police department.

Layton also said the Police Reserves will be used in their precincts on Wednesday. There are about 600 active police reservists.

DAYS OFF CANCELED

All days off have been canceled for the day of the march with restrictions on leave also in effect.

Layton said he is handling shift hours so that a maximum number of police will be on the street while precincts will not be stripped of personnel.

Nearby jurisdictions also are being requested to help the city by reporting the number of buses and demonstrators headed through their areas to Washington.

During the 1963 March on Washington, federal troops at nearby bases and from as far away as Ft. Bragg, N.C., were on alert, but were not used. There has been no announcement from the Pentagon but presumably a similar arrangement is being worked out.

More than 50 organizations—civic, labor, political and religious—pledged their support to the march at a mass meeting last

night at Turner Memorial A.M.E. Church, 600 I St. NW.

The Rev. Ralph David Abernathy, chairman of Solidarity Day and leader of the Poor People's Campaign, announced that Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers, had donated \$47,000 for next Wednesday's demonstration.

MORE THAN 300 AT MEETING

More than 300 people attended the meeting.

Among the organizations announcing their support were the Central Labor Council; Washington AFL-CIO; Washington Board of Rabbis; Metropolitan Conference of Citizens; Washington Teachers Union; Women's Strike for Peace; Medical Chirurgical Society of Washington; National Association of Social Workers; the Council of Churches of Greater Washington; the Americans for Democratic Action; Robert T. Freedman Dental Society and the Baptist Ministers Conference.

Tucker, who is on leave from his job as executive director of the Washington Urban League, to handle the Solidarity Day assignment, said that he is talking with federal agencies about the possibility of their granting leave to all federal employees who want to participate in the rally. He noted that leaves were granted in 1963 for the March on Washington.

RADIO CAMPAIGN SET

The Washington Board of Rabbis announced it would conduct a radio campaign promoting National Solidarity Day.

Charles Cheng, assistant to the president of the Washington Teachers Union, suggested such placard slogans as "Guaranteed Annual Income"; "U.S. Government is Racist"; and "End Troop Occupation in the Ghetto."

Tucker said that all slogans would be studied before being cleared this week.

Charles Jones, head of ACCESS (Action Coordinating Committee for Ending Segregation in the Suburbs) and a member of the Black United Front, criticized march leaders for not inviting the Black United Front to the meeting.

"The first thing you should do is recognize where the black community is, and I hope you will recognize that the Black United Front is where the power rests," Jones said.

"We don't want to confuse politics with funerals," he said. "It seems to me that the only time the nation becomes aware of the problem is at some vulgar ritual."

Abernathy, who spoke for about 30 minutes, said, "Everywhere I've gone I've found more white people than black people . . . I don't know why we're not reaching black people. I understand that the majority of the population is black. But somehow we are not reaching them."

TERMS OF PERMIT

The terms of the permit for next Wednesday's rally grants the use of federal grounds. David Rusk, executive director of the Urban League, said the permit allows the marchers to start assembling at 5 a.m. on the Washington Monument grounds. Entertainment will begin at the Monument at 10 a.m., with the march to the Lincoln Memorial beginning at noon.

The three-pronged march will consist of a column on either side of the Reflecting Pool, with a third column down the west-bound lane of Independence Avenue.

At 2 p.m., the formal program will begin at the Lincoln Memorial. Names of the speakers there are expected to be announced by tomorrow.

The permit stipulates that the Lincoln Memorial demonstration be completed by 4:30 p.m. Tucker said buses would then begin returning out-of-town Solidarity Day demonstrators home.

LEADERS OF MARCH LEAVE PITTS MOTEL FOR MIDCITY HOTELS

Most officials and staff members of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference have checked out of their Pitts Motor Hotel headquarters and have scattered into midtown hotels and other locations.

Only a few could be located at their new quarters this morning.

Several staffers of the Poor People's Campaign refused to say where the Rev. Ralph D. Abernathy is staying. The head of SCLC was in Atlanta for the weekend, and his top aide, the Rev. Andrew Young, was in Pittsburgh.

But other reliable sources said Abernathy has moved into a private apartment in the city. They would not say where.

A spokesman at the Washington Hilton Hotel acknowledged that some rooms have been rented to the civil rights organization. But he refused to say how many. Another SCLC group was located at the Howard Johnson Motor Lodge at 2601 Virginia Ave. NW.

There was no indication yesterday or today that SCLC staffers had moved into Resurrection City.

Cornelius Pitts, owner of the motel located at 1451 Belmont St. NW, said he was notified of the mass exodus of SCLC people in a letter from Abernathy, delivered by a secretary. The letter ordered cancellation of arrangements for all but two rooms.

HECTIC 7 WEEKS

The SCLC contingent had occupied 30 of the motel's 50 rooms and suites for seven weeks at rates from \$12 to \$25 a day.

Pitts said the move took him by surprise. SCLC had run up a bill of \$20,000. The owner said he was presented a check for \$17,000, leaving a balance of \$3,000.

The seven weeks were hectic both for Pitts and the civil rights organization that's conducting the Poor People's Campaign. There were frequent run-ins between some of the contingent and the hotel staff. Pitts himself was involved in several.

The SCLC leadership was under constant attacks from residents of Resurrection City, who demanded their leaders move to the campsite. The motel was the scene of at least two demonstrations by groups making such demands.

The last one was on June 7 when about 50 members of the Commandos of the Milwaukee NAACP Youth Council, led by the Rev. James E. Groppl, paraded through the corridors of the motel on an inspection of arrangements for the leaders. The Commandos later engaged Hosea Williams in a heated two-hour debate. On another occasion, the motel was invaded by the Invaders of Memphis.

Pitts said that he did not blame the demonstrations on SCLC leadership or personnel.

PRAISES ABERNATHY

"I never had any problems with the leaders," he stated. "There is no better man to work with than Dr. Abernathy. But there was some trouble from some of the militants and some people who were followers. I don't feel the leaders were responsible for those people."

However, an SCLC staffer said there was much friction between SCLC and the motel. He said "the motel just wasn't equipped to provide for a big party like ours."

In his letter to Pitts, Abernathy notified the owner to cancel all but two rooms—one to be used as a communications room and the other to house the personnel operating communications.

And in a postscript, Abernathy added, "It is mandatory that we move into Resurrection City immediately because of the urgency of our campaign." Pitts said he thought about approaching Abernathy after receiving the letter Friday morning, but didn't.

"In the best interest of all parties concerned, I am requesting that you immedi-

ately, completely cancel the SCLC, the Washington Poor People's Campaign account and total credit at Pitts Motel, with the exception of sleeping rooms 204 and 302," the letter said.

"SCLC will not be responsible for any food and beverage purchased after 12 noon Friday. Please allow me to express my wholehearted appreciation and my great desire to return as a resident of Pitts as soon as conditions will allow."

WON'T HURT BUSINESS

Pitts indicated the move won't hurt business. He said he did go to additional expense to convert some rooms into office space.

"Frankly, I am sorry to see them go," he added. "I made some purchases for them that I ordinarily would not have made. I wanted them to stay as long as possible because of the additional expenses and conversions we made. It was their idea to leave, not mine."

Pitts said he also had to pay for extra maintenance because of the number of people who came in to see SCLC officials. However, he said, the wear and tear was understandable and expected, and would have happened with any big group.

"I do look forward to their return when conditions permit," he said. "Dr. Abernathy is a beautiful man, and so are some of the other leaders."

PUERTO RICANS HOLD A RALLY ON MALL

More than 4,000 Puerto Ricans from the East and Midwest brought their support for the Poor People's Campaign to a happy, singing rally at the Sylvan Theater yesterday.

Even while the rally was going on at the Washington Monument grounds, leaders of the 6-week-old antipoverty campaign were pushing plans for Wednesday's climactic march.

Sterling Tucker, national coordinator for Solidarity Day, announced that preparations were going well and that time was the only enemy to a successful turnout for the demonstration. He refused to estimate how many are expected to come here.

SING, DANCE AND CLAP

At the Sylvan Theater, the Puerto Ricans from New York City, Chicago, Bridgeport, Conn., Cleveland and Philadelphia, clapped, danced, and sang to the music of several bands playing Spanish music.

Several hundred milled about the Monument souvenir stand, while others sought relief from the sun and heat under the trees or from soft drink vendors.

The nearly 100 buses that brought the demonstrators to the Capital unloaded at the Monument grounds.

Several of them were carrying signs that read, "Justice for Poor and Rich," "Help Us to Combat Poverty," "End Racial Prejudice," and "Black Is Beautiful, Tan Is Marvellous."

Gilberto Valentin, a member of the New York City Human Rights Commission and the day's march coordinator, told the group:

"We are here to fight for the Puerto Ricans, but in full sympathy for the poor of America."

WORK-STOPPAGE PLAN

Valentin threatened a one-day work stoppage by Puerto Ricans in New York City and a mass uprising to "change the government" if their demands are not met by Congress.

He said his countrymen would not work for one day to see how the city would function, but did not say when the work stoppage would be held.

The Rev. Ralph David Abernathy, leader of the Poor People's Campaign, welcomed the demonstrators to Washington. He said, "We are all one people and we have discovered that this nation has a power structure to keep all poor people poor and make the rich people richer."

Abernathy said the poor "are going to

stay here until something is done. If it isn't done we're going to stay here as long as Congress is here and then we will get out and go where they go."

PERMIT EXPIRES JUNE 23

Congress is not expected to adjourn until early in August. The extended permit for Resurrection City now expires on June 23.

The Puerto Ricans were also welcomed by Chief Big Snake, who identified himself as president of the Resurrection City Council, and Reles Lopez Tijerina, one of the Mexican-American leaders.

Abernathy conferred later with Tijerina and the Puerto Rican leaders a short distance from the demonstration. In the group was Bronx Borough President Herman Badillo, the city's first Puerto Rican to hold such an office.

At 4:45 p.m. the marchers left the Monument area to march to Arlington Cemetery to place wreaths at the graves of President Kennedy and Sen. Robert F. Kennedy.

MARCH 10 AHEAD

The marchers walked 10 abreast, dressed as though they were going to a picnic, and in a festive mood. As they passed Resurrection City they cried out to Negroes who leaned over the fence waving to them, "unity brothers, it's the way to go."

Some carried flags which said "Puerto Rican Youth Power." A sign read "How many Kennedys and Kings are going to die before something is done for the poor people?"

At the cemetery, leaders placed wreaths on the two graves. They paused briefly, then moved down the hill toward the buses which were waiting outside the cemetery.

After leaving the cemetery, the leaders drove to Resurrection City with a third wreath which they presented to leaders of the SCLC in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. They then returned to their buses, which took them home shortly before sundown.

DREAM "NOT FULFILLED"

Meanwhile, at a press briefing on the Solidarity Day march, Abernathy said that the nation and Congress must listen to the voices of reason and nonviolence that will be heard on Wednesday.

"There will also be anger in many of the voices," he warned, because the dream the slain Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. sounded at the 1963 March on Washington "has not been fulfilled."

He added that "When the sun goes down, the poor people of Resurrection City will still be here and we will know who supports us."

Although he was not certain of the details, Abernathy said the campaign's campsite would be open for inspection.

Tucker pointed out that there will not be any special provisions for government workers getting permission to take leave time to participate in the one-day march.

"It will be business as usual," he explained, "and it is hoped that government employees will be giving up a day's pay to participate. Thousands will be coming and we like to feel that it is so important that the contribution of a day's pay will be made."

JOHNSON MEETING

Tucker refused to speculate on the number of marchers expected beyond the 25,000 figure he released Friday.

When asked about a statement from the National Students Association that it will be bringing 25,000 to the march, Tucker said he believes that is the number NSA hopes to bring to Washington.

Abernathy said there are no plans yet to meet with President Johnson on Solidarity Day the way march leaders met with President John F. Kennedy in 1963.

Tucker announced that 1,000 marshals would come into town early Wednesday from New York City. They will come mostly from two volunteer associations—the "Van-

guards," a city police society, and the "Vulcans," a society of firemen.

Several religious groups have begun to send in statements of support for the march.

O'BOYLE LETTER

Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle, in a letter to be read throughout the diocese today, endorsed the march and said, "I encourage all those who are in sympathy with these goals to join with thousands of other Americans who will be marching to show their concern for eradicating poverty and violence from our midst."

He said that he will preside at a mass Auxiliary Bishop John S. Spence will offer at St. Patrick's Church, 10th and G Streets NW, at 10 a.m., the day of the march, to pray for its success.

Charles Warren, executive director of the Council of Churches of Greater Washington, said that the Poor People's Campaign has made a significant impact and called for every American to identify with the poor.

The United Methodists sent telegrams to 300 Methodist leaders throughout the country urging that a "massive expression of broad citizen support for the Poor People's Campaign is greatly needed."

Bishop James V. Shannon, auxiliary of Minneapolis-St. Paul and assistant chairman of the National Catholic News department, said he will march Wednesday.

OTHER SUPPORT GIVEN

Bishop John J. Wright, Episcopal chairman, department of Social Action, U.S. Conference, and Bishop of Pittsburgh, said:

"In this day of disquiet, let us by sympathy, prayer and intent to help, join with the spokesman for the poor in a day of solidarity..."

The National Council of Catholic Men and the National Conference of Catholic Women sent out a call for support and donated \$1,000 for the march.

In Northern Virginia, a support committee, similar to one in Montgomery County, Md., plans to show visible suburban action.

The Virginia group will meet at 8:30 a.m. at St. Thomas Moore Church at Arlington Boulevard and Glebe Road in Arlington and will be bused to the sailing marina south of the 14th Street bridge, and then be taken to the Monument grounds.

He did reveal that at some point in the campaign SCLC will "seek an audience with the President."

Tucker said one of Sen. Eugene McCarthy's aides has said the Minnesota Democrat was expecting to attend Solidarity Day.

He said Mrs. Martin Luther King Jr. and Mrs. Medgar Evers, wives of the slain civil rights leaders, have accepted honorary vice co-chairmanships for the march. Mrs. King will speak and Mrs. Evers, who is recovering from surgery, will send a statement.

The master of ceremonies for the speeches at the Lincoln Memorial will be Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, president emeritus of Morehouse College in Atlanta, who spoke at King's funeral in April.

Other speakers will be Abernathy, Tijerina, Valentin, Sen. Edward Brooke, R-Mass.; Rodolfo (Corky) Gonzales, another Mexican-American leader; Mrs. Martha Grass, Ponca City, Okla.; Ponca Indians; Dorothy Height, president, National Council of Negro Women; Walter Reuther, president, United Auto Workers; Mrs. Peggy Terry, Chicago, JOIN Community Action.

Also Mrs. Johnnie Tillmon, Los Angeles, National Welfare Rights Organization; Roy Wilkins, executive secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Whitney M. Young Jr., executive director, National Urban League; Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle, Washington Archdiocese; and Rabbi Jacob Rudin, of New York, president of the Synagogue Council of America.

BEVEL TELLS METHODISTS OF POOR'S GOAL

(By Caspar Nannes)

A leader of the Poor People's Campaign yesterday told the Baltimore United Methodist Church Conference that the problem facing the drive is not one of race but of economics.

The Rev. James Bevel, a top aide of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, said, "You have young people without employment or adequate education sitting around without means of support and doing nothing. Ask yourselves not what black people would do under these conditions but what any person would do."

Bevel told the 1,054 ministerial and lay delegates at Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church at Nebraska and New Mexico Avenues NW, that there's plenty of food available in our country but it's not distributed adequately.

"We are in a country of plenty and there is a lack of food," he declared. "We pay over 6,000 farmers more than \$25,000 each not to farm, yet we have children in Washington suffering from malnutrition."

Bevel asserted that there is a revolution going on, but it is one not of violence but of revealing proper relationships.

"The purpose of the Poor People's Campaign is to get America to see. At this point in history we need a lot of ministers and a lot of people to witness."

The conference voted a budget for the remaining seven months of this year, June 1 to Dec. 31, of over \$1.8 million. The reason for the abbreviated period is that the conference will start next year observing a calendar year rather than a fiscal year.

Largest appropriation in the budget included World Service \$322,252; Conference Benevolences \$750,298; administrative items \$83,591, and a contingent fund of \$8,750. To these figures was added \$654,363 for what is known as direct apportionments. These include such items as the pension fund, \$337,147, and the minimum salary fund, \$140,000.

A flurry occurred yesterday when a resolution creating a post of coordinator of urban work was presented to the conference. A white man apparently had been selected for the job, but one delegate, the Rev. Joe L. Gipson, of Nash Methodist Church in Washington, declared:

"Because of the polarization that has already taken place over society, it would seem more reasonable to elect a black man to this job. The white man would have difficulty communicating with the black community in urban work."

As a result of the objections of Gipson, a Negro, the motion was changed so that Bishop John Wesley Lord of Washington could name a man, without regard to race, to the job within 90 days.

THE HOUSE OF THE TECHNOCRATS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the very loyal and effective role that Greece plays in the NATO alliance and fully recognizing the very full opposition that has been maintained against the present government of Greece, I was especially interested in an article in the very influential German paper, *Die Zeit*, which appeared in its June 4 edition.

The article entitled "The Hour of the Technocrats," presented a very balanced report on Greece.

Having visited Greece last fall and recognizing the geographic significance of that land as well as the historic friendship of the Greek people to the United States, I remain convinced that it is in the basic interests of the United States to work closely with the present Greek government. We should restore military aid to this valued ally and continue to encourage the present regime to maintain its timetable of reconstructing constitutional government.

The article referred to, follows:

THE HOUR OF THE TECHNOCRATS

(By Karl-Heinz Janssen)

(NOTE.—Translated from the June 4, 1968, edition, page 5, of the influential German newspaper, *Die Zeit*.)

After January 30, 1933, one saw emerging in the German ministries and offices, in organizations and unions intelligent, young men who, in the belief of a good cause, out of love for their nation, gave voluntarily their utmost in the service of the "revolution."

In Greece, after the military putsch of April 1967 and more than ever after the miserable failure of the counterputsch of the king, an analogous situation took place. Naturally, the new regime in Athens does not appreciate such comparisons. In spite of all the speeches about the "true, genuine democracy", it cannot obscure the fact that this land at the present time is ruled dictatorially. Parliament has been dismissed; Papadopoulos can order and direct as much as he wants without having to fear any protracted parliamentary debate, any so-called horse trading by the parties, any intervention, revision or rejection. This was the hour and the opportunity for the technocrats.

The regime gave instructions for their co-operation after parliament and the parties had been set aside and about 2,000 high government officials dismissed. The technocrats stood ready in the background; ambitious professional men, highly intelligent industrial managers and ministerial officials. They all possessed precise concepts of Greece for the future but in the last turbulent years of Greek democracy no one listened to them nor did they see any possibility of developing their ideas.

A new generation has placed itself at the switchboard of power; full of spirit, full of optimism, eager for work, clever and extremely sharp, a mixture of American management and German thoroughness. They talk little about democracy; on the whole it appears irrelevant to them which state they serve provided it gives them sufficient latitude and offers a government of highest efficiency.

By far, two key positions have attracted the technocrats. One is the ministry of the prime minister, a kind of super ministry with 1400 authorized positions of which 600 are filled. It does the staff work for everything which transpires in the government. The other is the coordination ministry, a quasi super economic cabinet with 420 associates and a number of helpful scientific institutes. The five-year development plan was worked up here which by 1972 will enable Greece to join the modern industrial community.

"If in this time we raise the average income from 710 to 1000 dollars, there will be no longer be any social unrest in this country and then we shall be the most stable nation of the west", so said to me one of the young scientists of the ministry of the prime minister. So say all of them. They do not even consider the possibility of failure. No thought is given that increasing prosperity will also

increase the needs, indeed eventually that prosperity can bring forth revolution. And only during a midnight drink of retsina brings on the concern that some day the arch evil of corruption could again catch hold of them and crush their budding dreams.

"We are destined to succeed", is the motto of the technocrats. Their goals are impressive enough:

Full employment and creation of 350,000 new jobs.

Raising of the living standard through an equitable distribution of the national income, above all in favor of the laborer and the farmer.

Reform of the educational system, strengthened social and health assistance which is at an inadequate level throughout the land. Support of public and private housing construction.

A build-up of the infra structure (roads, bridges, harbors, irrigation, power plants, communications), increase of productivity.

Restructuring of the economy in favor of industrialization at the expense of agriculture.

Private initiative will be greatly encouraged. Even if Nasser tendencies are attributed to some members of the junta, for the technocrats in the coordination ministry is the opinion of their minister Makarezos authoritative: "The government is the worst entrepreneur". Controlled economy is despised: the economic process will be controlled only by marketing means—through appropriate incentives, by easing of credit and by financing of project studies. Where bureaucratic red-tape appears, it will be set aside with a stroke of the pen.

For the first time in thirty years the national budget was presented on January 1. "Previously, one usually governed a half year without a budget and another three months passed before adjournment! This will not happen again!" What wonder if the parliament is sent on an extended vacation . . . More claim for pride has the regime in the prompt readjustment of the budget. In one year the deficit of 3.6 billion drachma was wiped out and even an excess of 960 million drachma was realized. The austerity policy was not without its painful side effects. For example, archeology, so to speak a national science, upon which the image of Greece in foreign countries depends in large measure, lacks the resources to engage in large excavation projects. With the previous regimes money was never a problem. Today it is not unusual if the director of the museum personally secures the exhibits. . . .

To be sure, the economic growth of Greece during the first year of the "revolution" was slowed down. Without beating around the bush the minister and advisers admit that the shock of the military putsch had a negative reaction internally and externally. The number of tourists dropped in 1967 by about 15%. Besides the junta had the bad luck of beginning the putsch in the middle of a recession. Unexpected misfortunes came on top of this: the Suez Canal blockade and the war psychosis of the last Cyprus crisis. Another negative psychological factor was the continuous fear of a counter putsch which, in fact did occur on December 13, brought forth additional delays. In view of these burdens, so the thinking goes, an economic growth rate of 4.6%, measured even by European standards, is quite significant.

In the last few months signs have appeared which indicate a new upswing. If only the negative reports in the foreign press were . . . like magic wand which with one blow out of the hated dictator would emerge the beaming goddess Democracy, the regime has propagated the plan for the new constitution which in the fall will be presented to the people for a referendum. Through the newspapers the people were asked to participate in the discussion by submitting proposals for revisions. Allegedly 180,000 letters

have been received by the constitution commission.

One believes the president of the constitution commission, the German educated jurist Mitrelias, that he and his colleagues accepted this task out of patriotic conviction in order to frame the ideal constitution. He assured me that none of the constitution commission was allied with the junta. Each one had accepted this task with the firm understanding that they would be free in reaching their decisions. The government merely indicated the basic direction to be followed: Greece shall have the form of a constitutionally governed liberal democracy. As a model, the commission has relied upon the Bonn basic constitutional law, the Gaullist and Turkish constitution.

The plebiscite does not alter the plain fact that the Greek people themselves did not select the members of the constitution committee. To the question from whence does the government gain its authority to place the constitution before the people, Mitrelias gave the classical answer: "Each revolution creates its own authority." His commission may conclude with exemplary articles. . . . but the regime reserves for itself the final decision.

Prime Minister Papadopoulos takes great pains to give the impression that he, in the last analysis, will decide boldly and liberally. Reference to an ominous article in the constitution according to which all meetings shall be strictly forbidden at which the overthrow of the regime or of the prevailing social order is to be discussed, he replied like a pistol shot: "Is changed!" When he recognized just at this moment what weakness a regime has which requires such an article in the constitution, he was prompt and quick witted enough to remove this target of international attack.

Another article which in view of the recent riots in France and the anti-Emergency Law demonstrations in West Germany deserves special attention concerns the prohibition of political strikes. According to the present plan (Article 13, paragraph 4) strike is inadmissible if it has political or other grounds which run counter to the material or moral interests of the workers. Officials of the Greek labor unions assure one that they are presently negotiating with the government concerning this passage. To be sure they do not wish to have an explicit guarantee of the right to political strike but the present proposal seems to them to be too restrictive. According to their conception, a strike shall be permitted if the "ethical, spiritual and material interests of the working people" require it. This form could, if necessary, also legalize a political strike.

The relationships between the junta and the unions are to all appearances cool and correct. The head of the labor unions, Makris, a short wiry man with a Caesar-like head who receives his visitors under a picture of the crucifixion, has held his position almost without interruption since 1948. He recommends himself to the regime from his fervent anti-communist feelings which he does not hesitate to show with pride. In order to understand his attitude, one must be well versed in the changing history of the Greek labor unions which is filled with continuous power struggles between the communists and socialists. Without compassion Makris speaks of the imprisoned or deported officials of those forbidden 200 organizations which allegedly were controlled by the EDA (The Greek Communist Party): "They are not real labor unionists. The IFGB (The International Federation of Trade Unions) maintains unswervingly that there are labor union officials in prison but up to now they have not told me the name of a single person."

The Greek military regime, which according to Papadopoulos' words has raised "social

politics" to a program, must naturally be on good terms with the workers' officials. In spite of the imposed price freeze by the regime, a series of wage increases have been arranged, partly through local contracts and partly through collective bargaining.

The disapproving and distant attitude of the DGB (German Labor Unions) concerning the conditions in Greece has given the labor officials in Athens a matter to deal with. Makris has even considered whether he should simply go to Dusseldorf to ask for understanding of his country. "Now is not the time to criticize politics. Support us, then we can change much!"

This statement of the labor union leader says more concerning the Greek situation than would be possible from a dozen reports of a trip to Greece. To whom the matter of Greek freedom lies closest to one's heart, who wishes not only more prosperity but also more political rights for the amiable and hospitable people of the Aegean, he should reflect in good time how he may best help those whom he wants to support. NATO and the European Assembly neglected to intervene for the rights of the Greeks when there was still time to do so. Now when the regime is no longer easily removed from its position, one must doubt with justification whether a tourist boycott, a cessation of economic and military aid, an expulsion from the European Assembly really serves the Greek people. A better method seems to be to remind the regime continuously of their promises and to denounce again and again those practices which violate democratic and constitutional principles.

SOCIETY'S FAULT IS IN TAKING ALL BLAME

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, recently a most pertinent and incisive editorial was called to my attention, which had appeared in one of the major newspapers of north Texas, the Fort Worth Star-Telegram.

Because of the logic of what is said in that editorial and because of the definiteness with which it delivers the message it seeks to convey, it deserves the attention of all. Accordingly, under unanimous consent I submit the editorial, "Society's Fault Is in Taking All Blame," for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIETY'S FAULT IS IN TAKING ALL BLAME

We are on a new binge of analyzing American society, and the echoes come back from London, Paris, Cairo and numerous other places around the world. If the man who killed Sen. Robert F. Kennedy is not even an American it seems to hinder little the diagnosis of a sick, sick society which erupts into violence because it does not know what else to do about its frustrations and other forms of discontent.

We have a heritage of violence on our frontiers, we hear, and that is why public figures are shot to death. It is true that there was violence on the frontiers. Blood, sweat, toil and tears. We hear much about the blood, but little about the sweat, toil and tears. There also was hard work, and there was suffering caused by the heat and the cold and crop failures. There were people striving to build safe, peaceful and respectable communities. We don't hear so much of the sweat, toil and tears because the blood makes a more exciting story—some people think.

We are told that society is to blame for rioting, looting, burning and all sorts of rebellion against constituted authority. People are unhappy with the way things are going, and they can't be blamed if they show it by throwing rocks, setting fires, sniping from roofs, taking what they want from stores, burning their country's flag or taking over university campuses. They are exercising their right of freedom of expression.

So, the diagnosis is that American society is sick and it should take all the blame. The idea is repeated and embellished all over the world.

Sure, there are faults in American society. For one thing, it has been too long on that psychiatrist's couch plying itself. It ought to get up and go to work. It could cure some of its troubles if it quit the foolishness of excusing its unruly members for the troubles they cause.

We do not need new laws to prevent murders, looting and burning. We need to enforce the ones we have. Society would be much healthier if it recognized that the murderer is the one who is guilty of murder, the rioters are the guilty ones in riots, the looters are the ones who are guilty when stores are looted and arsonists are guilty when there is arson.

When American society gets back to making offenders—determined by just and legal procedures—responsible for offenses it will have gone far toward recovery from its current illness.

REAL REVOLUTIONARIES

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Times-Herald of Newport News, Va., on Monday, June 10, 1968, a fine editorial commenting generally on Prince Edward County, Va., and particularly on the Prince Edward Academy, which is a private school.

Some of you may have forgotten, but many of us remember the tragic decision of the so-called Supreme Court of the United States of America in 1954 which struck a body blow at public education in America.

The Prince Edward County School Board was one of the litigants in this case. The white people of Prince Edward County have demonstrated time and again the same courage and determination and wisdom that was displayed by our Founding Fathers who wrought out this great Nation of ours. The people of that county are a progressive people. They believe in Americanism. They believe in the private enterprise system and individual initiative; that the Government never was intended to support the people, but that the people were to support the Government and at the same time provide for themselves.

Many prophets of gloom and doom predicted that Prince Edward County could not go forward because of its educational system. The editorial points out cogently how false this was. I admire and highly commend the leaders of Prince Edward County, those leaders who have guided the people so well in these perilous and hectic days since 1954. They have progressed equally, if not better, than most areas in the Nation. They have

educated their children. They have secured new industry and have kept the faith.

Mr. Speaker, when I think of the criminals assaulting citizens on our streets with impunity, crowds blocking our thoroughfares with demonstrations and marches, mobs burning and looting in our cities, and college students disrupting education in our colleges and universities, a sense of despair creeps over me. Fortunately, I can help drive it away with the realization that in the Fourth District of Virginia our people, with few exceptions, have not been a part of this dismal spectacle of anarchy and irresponsibility. Then, too, I recall that at the beginning of this decade, TV and the press pointed to one of the counties in our district as the symbol of southern racism and backwardness. Prince Edward County was constantly under fire from the executive and judicial branches of the Federal Government as well as the press. The people of Prince Edward generally chose to go on working out their problems rather than answering unfair criticism from outside. The results can only be described as productive and progressive to a commendable degree.

Prince Edward Academy has developed into an exemplary private school which has served as a model for many other schools throughout the South. More than 80 percent of its graduating class this year will attend college and prepare themselves to better serve our society. The academy buildings are superior to the vast majority of school buildings in the entire area. A large and accomplished band gives its annual concert to overflow audiences. The athletic program is full, varied, and successful. All of this has occurred despite a hostile court which still denies to this one county in all of Virginia access to tuition grant funds. Civic spirit is the answer and the country should take note.

What newsmen tried to picture as undesirable has attracted through its own efforts multimillion-dollar subsidiary plants of two national corporations, and this is not the end. Crime, including juvenile delinquency, is no problem at all compared to the rest of the country, thanks to the efficiency of town and county police and to the sense of responsibility local parents instill in their children. A new airport, two expanding colleges, and well-developed recreational programs are among the many things which mark this community as progressive and forward looking. The responsibility and cooperation among some of the colored and white leaders to prevent lawlessness and disorder demonstrates that race relations in Prince Edward County are vastly superior to some of the so-called avant garde urban communities. Women and children can walk down the streets with a sense of safety unknown in Washington, D.C., or New York City.

My district is essentially rural, where people are close to the soil and close to each other. Presidential commissions are probing the causes of crime, violence, juvenile delinquency, riots, and many other modern ills. Instead of searching the cities to find out why these things

happen, they might spend some time in my district finding out why they do not happen. They could start with Prince Edward County.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial entitled "Real Revolutionaries."

REAL REVOLUTIONARIES

FARMVILLE, VA.—The restless spirit of Colonial Virginia thrives in Prince Edward county, and where historical markers remind a traveler that General Robert E. Lee retreated through the gentle sloping foothills of the Blue Ridge, the citizens of this fiercely independent community have accomplished a miracle.

Just south of the meandering Appomattox, between Bush and Sandy Creek on 52 acres is burgeoning Prince Edward Academy, the county's answer to the forces of welfare statism reaching down from Washington.

Nine years ago, the parents of 1,200 Prince Edward County children, through the Prince Edward School Foundation, established the Academy rather than to accept the fetters and strictures of federal regulation. This obvious successful concept of individuality is working well at the Academy, where, from this rural community of Farmville, 81 percent of the Class of 1968 will be entering college in September. It is an incredible percentage of graduates seeking higher education, and speaks for itself of the quality of education and the motivation afforded Prince Edward Academy students.

Upper School students are guided and taught at the ratio of one teacher per 18 pupils; the Lower School ratio is one to 23. Quantitatively, this is about 20 per cent better than standards required by the Commonwealth.

With ferocious vindictiveness, the Supreme Court has ruled that of all the private schools in the state, parents sending their children to this private academy may not receive tuition grants. So parents must handle tuition fees without help. Nevertheless the independent spirit of the Academy's board of directors, has resulted in scholarship contributions of \$51,398 to aid those who cannot pay the full amount of tuition. Presently, that fund is \$21,061 less than its requirement for the coming year, and contributions are invited.

The Class of 1968 raised \$1,000 this year and another effort raised an additional \$650.

This "do-it-yourself" spirit is typical of the community and in turn there appeared on the Academy campus a swimming pool, an athletic field, a lighted baseball park, and extensive landscaping, all courtesy of the several civic clubs of the county.

At a time when the nation is watching segments of youth destroy academic icons without something of value to replace them, the people of Prince Edward are attempting to smash the tentacles of federalism spreading across the land by replacing control of the educational process through independent action with a system of education protected from federal rule by coercion.

It is spreading, too, fueled by rising public resentment against bureaucratic decrees which are destroying the public school systems of the nation. In the past five years, more than 100 similarly operated schools have been organized to benefit from these concepts of independence and individuality cultivated at Prince Edward Academy.

To an observer beginning a series of visits around the state during this commencement season, this is the kind of revolution that began in the Hall of the House of Burgesses in Williamsburg and achieved reality in Philadelphia.

It is a rebellion against the malignant growth of government by dictatorship, by executive order, and by legislative decree of the courts.

**HUNGER: AN AMERICAN
NATIONAL EMERGENCY**

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1968

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, for several decades, political theorists and astute observers the world over have pointed out that those nations which are most vulnerable to takeover by Communist and totalitarian or military regimes are those whose people suffer from hunger, from lack of education, and from general hopelessness concerning their condition.

Wisely, the United States and other developed nations, in response to this observation, has provided programs designed to bolster the economies and improve the conditions of life in the underdeveloped areas of the globe. The Agency for International Development even has a branch program called the war on hunger to coordinate our food assistance programs for foreign peoples.

Perhaps not so wisely, we have not so far grasped the scope of this same problem within our own borders. Slowly, over the past decade, America has become aware of joblessness in its midst. We have seen growing concern with undereducated and uneducated Americans—in the inner cities and in the rural areas of many States. We are even becoming aware of the existence of hopelessness in our land of opportunity. Families in their third generation of dependence on public assistance payments, and the widespread news coverage of the Poor People's March have brought home to many of our people the fact that not all Americans have been able to share in the great opportunities which our country offers the great majority of its people.

But hunger? Hunger, Mr. Speaker, is a word we in America have always associated with Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Surely in our land, where farmers are paid to hold back production of some commodities because of surpluses, there could be no hunger. But there is hunger, and widespread hunger, here in the United States.

An ongoing exchange of charges and countercharges between the Department of Agriculture and the Columbia Broadcasting Co. has brought this fact plainly before the American people. A recent television documentary entitled "Hunger in America" has brought hundreds of spontaneous constituent letters to my office door. Whether the specific charges of this program, or the denials and statistics of the Department of Agriculture, are more accurate in fact, one thing is clear—there is an alarming number of people in America who cannot afford to feed themselves and their children, and an even greater number whose daily intake of food does not even approach the quantity or quality needed to sustain a healthy human body.

Another fact is also clear: The anti-hunger programs now being administered by the Department of Agriculture, while they have markedly and rapidly

improved in the past few years, are not doing the job that must be done to eliminate widespread hunger. It is hard to be impressed with figures showing that the Department of Agriculture's efforts are providing more and more millions of people with more and more nutritious food, when we know there are additional millions—millions—who are still beyond the reach of these programs, whose children's stomachs swell with hunger and malnutrition as much as those of youngsters shown in any Peace Corps film on hunger abroad.

Each night at dinnertime, American parents caution their children not to waste food by reminding them of less fortunate starving peoples in India or Armenia. In some homes, I am sure, children reluctant to clean their plates are now cautioned to think of hungry children in Mississippi. But the plain fact is that there are hungry children within a few miles of every dinner table in the United States.

WHY IS THIS A FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY?

Throughout U.S. history each man has been expected to be the provider for his own family. Good food, warm clothes and a sturdy home were the rewards of hard work—and well they should be. In a predominately agricultural society, those whom the economy could not employ could employ themselves by growing food for the family, and by building a home and weaving cloth for self-sustenance. But this is not always possible in the urban America of today. Impoverished city dwellers do not have the land or resources to exercise this alternative of years past. Even poor families in rural areas frequently do not own land, and are sometimes subject to some landlord-imposed controls on what they may grow.

Our highly technical society is based on the earning and possession of money—the procurer of all goods and services. Those who cannot work, cannot earn. But this does not mean that they and their families should be left to starve. Those who can work but refuse to work present a problem more relevant to reform in our welfare laws.

Hunger is unlike other responsibilities of government, its solution cannot await long and drawn out deliberation among various levels of government to decide which level has the responsibility to deal with the problem, before action is taken. Hunger must be looked upon by our Government as it is looked upon by its victims—as a crisis which cannot wait until next month, or even until tomorrow for a solution.

As a stopgap measure, to provide instantly the needed expansion in our food stamp program, I have introduced a bill which provides an open-ended authorization for the food stamp program beginning July 1, 1968. Present limitations on spending for this vital program have prevented hundreds of counties which want to participate from doing so. Some have been waiting since the end of 1967 to begin food stamp distribution. Also, those of us who are sponsoring this legislation urge that no stringent limit on appropriations for the program be al-

lowed to deny food to hungry people who otherwise could be fed via food stamps.

This bill does not provide an overall or long range solution, Mr. Speaker. It does insure that until we can reorganize, reassign and revitalize our antihunger effort, millions in these nonparticipating countries can be fed.

As a long range goal, I have suggested that we carefully consider whether the Agriculture Department is the appropriate arm of the Government to operate antihunger programs. There are many who have made the point that food distribution to the hungry consumer, and price and market protection for the farmer are goals which at times run at cross purposes. If food distribution programs are dependent on surplus, or on market conditions to too great an extent, then the goal of providing an adequate, nutritious diet to the hungry may be compromised.

The Education and Labor Committee has already held hearings to investigate the effectiveness of the USDA programs. As a member of a bipartisan congressional group studying hunger, I suggest that perhaps the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, whose goals, personnel, and experience may be better suited to feeding the hungry, should be considered as an heir to this vital effort. Its responsibilities in the area of health, particularly, and its concern with the needs of children—the most tragic victims of hunger in America—make HEW worthy of consideration for long range changes in our antihunger effort.

The Agriculture Department, Mr. Speaker, has both expanded and improved its offering of antihunger programs. It has markedly increased the number and quality of food commodities available for distribution under the commodity distribution program. But, hampered by both legislation, local willingness and program administration, their improvement has not come fast enough or far enough to achieve a satisfactory solution to the problem of hunger.

Hunger is an American national emergency. It must be treated both as a national problem, with the accompanying Federal initiative, and with emergency measures—so that the next meal and not the next generation of hungry Americans becomes our target.

**SENATOR BOB GRIFFIN: ONE OF
THE BEST**

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker an old friend of mine and a Member of the House of Representatives for more than a decade has moved on to that other distinguished body where he is rapidly establishing a reputation as one of the most able of our U.S. Senators.

In the short time that BOB GRIFFIN has been a Member of the U.S. Senate he has become an important and imposing national figure, a man whose horizons

are expanding and whose limits are still unknown.

Like myself, a great many of his colleagues recognized long ago that BOB GRIFFIN had all the makings of one of the great ones. So it is not surprising that he is receiving widespread commendation throughout the country. A sample of that affirmation and praise is contained in the following editorial which appeared recently in the Pontiac Press, a newspaper located in Pontiac, Mich., and serving my congressional district. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

FRESHMAN GIVEN HIGH MARKS IN EXACTING SENATORIAL TEST

As time passes, we hear an increasing number of favorable reports on Michigan's new Senator—Robert Griffin.

Senator Griffin is slowly working himself into the role of one of the important figures in the world's greatest legislative body. He has to serve a freshman apprenticeship of sorts. Let there be no mistake about that. Brother Senators make absolutely certain no one escapes the traditions of this distinguished and powerful body.

But during the period of servility and subservience, they are shrewdly appraised and graded by cautious brethren and by their constituents back home. Senator Griffin is passing both tests admirably. When a line of action arises with which he is in accord, the Wolverine digs in solidly and helps make things move in the direction he favors. His Washington experience helps mightily. He will never bog down or descend to the "me, too" level. Senator Griffin is also rightly self-assertive.

As time passes, I believe this fledgling in the Senate will move onward into the most influential and powerful circles. Apparently he is destined to emerge as one of the leaders and motivating influences in shaping and formulating party, national and international policies.

Michigan did well when she sent this capable, energetic and stout-hearted man to represent the Wolverine Commonwealth in Washington in this capacity. He brings back pleasant memories of Senator Arthur Vandenberg who was one of the two or three most influential men in all Congress over an extended period of time.

The Press breaks into applause for this new Senator.

THE MODERN IMPERATIVE

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud to be able to say that Kent State University is located within my congressional district. This school, under the direction and guidance of its outstanding president, Dr. Robert I. White, its aggressive faculty with full cooperation of its board of trustees, has grown in the last decade to be one of the largest and finest universities in America.

On the occasion of Kent State University's 55th spring commencement, Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, president emeritus of Johns Hopkins University and former president of Pennsylvania State University and Kansas State University, delivered the commencement address.

Since Dr. Milton Eisenhower was re-

cently appointed by the President as Chairman of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, it has occurred to me that my fellow colleagues might find his address of special interest.

Dr. Eisenhower's lucid and challenging address appears below:

THE MODERN IMPERATIVE

(Commencement address by Milton S. Eisenhower, Kent State University, June 8, 1968)

I am delighted to visit Kent State University again, and am proud to take part in your 1968 commencement ceremony. But in all candor I must confess at once that if you expect from me a typical commencement address you will be disappointed. Traditionally, a speaker on such an occasion is supposed to suggest to you candidates for degrees specifically how you can cope with the complex problems you will face as you assume the obligations of citizenship.

The problems are obvious. The answers are elusive. Indeed, I knew the answers much better, more surely, at the time of my own graduation than I do now.

My difficulty, which perhaps you will come to share, is that changes—basic changes—are so numerous and rapid in our society as to confound me, along with the wisest and most sophisticated among us. Our hands are being made obsolete by machines, our minds hypnotized by computers and formulae, our consciousness depersonalized by automation, and our perspective shattered by world events.

More changes have occurred in the United States in the past century than in any prior period and, I am inclined to think, than in all of previous history. Indeed, in my relatively short life-time, I have witnessed most of these changes and often have been bewildered by them. It would be a man of great self-assurance who felt he understood all of their implications.

II

Occasionally, when I contemplate this bewildering era, I reflect upon an earlier time and indulge in the luxury of nostalgia. Then I see in the sleepy town of Abilene, Kansas a cozy white house, surrounded by colorful hollyhocks, a flourishing orchard, and a generous vegetable garden. My brothers and I sit on the front porch in rocking chairs observing the drift of the seasons and the passing of the small segment of the world we know. There is no war, no domestic turmoil, no protest marches, no campus sit-ins, no complex problems to bother us. We, like others of our town, are isolated. Our community is self-contained economically, physically, socially. We have not heard of world interdependence. All is peaceful and we are quite content.

But the essence of nostalgia is an awareness that what has been will never be again. The streams of history may be likened to the ceaseless flow of a giant river. Man can work with the river, building dams and dikes, seeking to have its enormous energy serve the good of man rather than to destroy. But he cannot stop the waters from reaching the ocean. So it is with the currents of history which in our time have reached flood stage.

Most of my age have witnessed those raging currents with astonishment, often in confusion and with serious misgivings.

In Abilene, we had rude awakenings as we came to understand the nature and hazards of modern change.

We had supposed that our economic welfare depended solely upon weather conducive to crop growth and upon hard work, but suddenly despite perfect weather and efficient work, we found our farmers going broke because Italy raised its tariff on wheat and later because Britain devalued the pound.

Soon, and not related to our difficulty, the United States suffered its worst depression. Abilene's economic self-containment—and that of the nation too—was shattered.

Our physical isolation also disappeared. I was a freshman in high school before I ventured so far away as Kansas City, Missouri, one hundred and sixty miles down the Union Pacific tracks; alone I had serious misgivings on that strange trip, and when I got off the train I was sure Kansas City was the largest metropolitan area in the world and quite possibly a den of iniquity. But in a few years thereafter I was traveling to most nations of the world, with greater physical comfort, less fear of the unknown, and in not much more time than I experienced on that first trip away from Abilene.

And our social self-containment was viciously destroyed, for we of Abilene found ourselves in one world war caused, not seemingly by anything we of my town had done, but by an explosion in the Balkans; in a few years we were in another conflict, due to an infamy at Pearl Harbor and the insane ambitions of a corporal in Germany.

So we were forced to recognize that the streams of events were toward the unification of our world, a unification which, to succeed, required genuine intercultural understanding, juridical equality of nations, mutuality in human relations, and a global willingness to forego lesser and more selfish purposes in order to concentrate successfully on the transcendent goals of positive peace and rising levels of well-being for all, wherever they lived, whatever their color, nationality, or basic philosophy.

This was an historical imperative confronting us—as promising as life itself and as inevitable as death. But unhappily, we, as human beings, were not ready for this imperative.

Changes in every circumstance of life have accelerated, but human attitudes have remained generally inflexible. And so, in most of this century, the world has lived in chaotic revolution of manifold phases and significance.

III

At the core of revolutionary change are science and technology, in which change is so rapid as to confound all but the most sophisticated. When I was a youngster, there was not a single industrial research laboratory in the United States. Fundamental research in our universities was in its infancy. Now, we are essentially dominated by scientific and technological developments. Ninety percent of all scientists who ever lived are alive today. Their achievements are monumental. Human knowledge doubles every ten years. Indeed, in a single year, biological and physical scientists alone publish nearly 1,400,000 books, monographs, and technical articles, and the new knowledge is put into use almost instantly. Thus, eighty percent of the drugs administered in our hospitals today were unknown a decade ago, and half the products of some of our leading industries have been conceived in industrial research laboratories in the last fifteen years. But the most dramatic example is in the field of national security. For thousands of years a weapon system was valid for five hundred years. In the latter part of the nineteenth century a system was good for fifty years. Now the most sophisticated elements of the system are essentially obsolete in five years.

Science and technology, penetrating atoms and genes, exploring space, and mechanizing civilizations, are changing how we work, how we organize, how we think and how we live. They are profoundly affecting our relations with other free nations, dominating our relations with the center of international communism and insistently posing the critical question of our time: Will expanding knowledge and powerful new instruments lead us to the Golden Age which has eluded man since creation, or to mutual annihilation?

Science, with all its wonders, does not supply the answer. Science tells us what is possible, not what is right. Science tells us what we can do, not what we should do. The answer lies not with scientific man, but with all of us—with social man.

A significant sub-element in modern technological change involves modern transportation, buttressed by world-wide instantaneous communication. These have shrunk the earth, brought peoples closer together. They have enhanced economic interdependence, so much so that today the plants in our great industrial empire would cease to belch smoke and millions would be out of work if we could not import vital primary commodities from sixty different nations and, in payment, could not ship to them and others vast quantities of food, fibre, and manufactured goods.

And, needless to say, economic interdependence has made essential solid and dependable political and human relations. But here is the rub! The imperative has come too soon. It has preceded mental preparation for it. Most of the peoples of the world grossly misunderstand the United States—its social structure, its philosophy, its global purposes. And our conceptions of others are not much more valid than theirs of us. So, too, often, decisions, profoundly important decisions, are made by us and other nations not on the basis of what really is, but on the basis of what, in prejudice and ignorance, people think it is. While understanding would not itself guarantee the peaceful conditions modern life demands, it is surely true that there will not be positive peace without better mutual understanding than now prevails.

Concurrently with these measurable changes, and partly because of them—all, I emphasize within one short lifetime—a human revolution has suddenly arisen to confound and haunt us. We are most familiar with the philosophic conflict between East and West. But in Latin America, where for centuries a few lived midst fabulous riches while oceans of illiterates lived in squalor, there is at this moment the danger of massive revolt. The question is whether it will be bloody or characterized by rapid, democratic, social change. Radio and television, modest products of the scientific revolution, have reached the minds of the masses who cannot read but can see and hear. So, overnight, they have come to understand that human degradation is neither universal nor inevitable. After a long sleep, giants in Latin America, and in Africa, the Middle East, and the Far East are awake, angrily shaking the archaic social structures that have oppressed them.

Already they have all but eliminated imperialism in the free world, thus reversing several hundred years of history for European nations, about fifty years for us. Unfortunately, this change in the free world, meriting applause, has been paralleled by the development of a new, more vicious imperialism in Eastern Europe and the Far East, involving a third of the three billion persons who inhabit the earth.

These manifold and other rapidly-moving historic forces are forcing us to the very brink of critical decision at a time, as I have said, when the minds of men are not prepared to cast out prejudice and to reason together in mutual understanding and mutual respect.

As I seek to shape my own views, I honestly at moments would welcome a return to the isolation, contentment, and certainties of my youth. Of course I know the futility of such passing thoughts. So I try to consider things as they now are and, without implying any criticism of any specific action now under way, I must in candor say I am persuaded that the time is here when we should reappraise our posture and our methods in the world.

Since World War II, four national adminis-

trations have adhered to the policy of opposing the coercive spread of communism. This is defended on moral grounds. But I am convinced the policy is doomed to ultimate failure unless other free nations join us in every critical situation in the application of this policy. I believe that the achievement of a dependable alliance, confederation, or transnational compact is the most important single obligation upon statesmen at this moment.

I am also persuaded that foreign aid, as we have conceived and practiced it for a quarter of a century, is little more than a palliative, sometimes self-defeating. But, given consistent concerted action by all free nations and especially the industrial nations, I can foresee a successful check upon imperialistic communism, and a type of foreign aid, multilaterally financed and administered, that will help the peoples of the less advanced nations gradually improve their well-being in a world of assured security.

Where do we begin? Highest priority, in any reappraisal of our posture and methods, must in my judgment begin with power: Peace wherever it exists—in Ohio, in the United States, or in the larger world around us—is partly the product of power. No one nation possesses sufficient power to enforce global peace, nor would its exercise by a single power, even if possessed in abundance, be acceptable to others. So we must, I suggest, moderate preconceptions about absolute sovereignty and address ourselves to the methods by which nations, all believing in human dignity, mutuality in human relations, and the free choice of peoples, may pool their power, or create new power, to enforce global peace. This has been achieved to a limited extent by the United Nations and by NATO. The need now is to expand the NATO concept—which is transnational rather than multi-national—to all free nations and, eventually, to every country of the world.

This negative approach—for that is obviously what it is—must yield us the time, so desperately needed by men everywhere to foster education and genuine mutual understanding; to improve health and increase productivity; to develop more enlightened trade, aid and credit relationships; to banish discrimination everywhere; to do all the multitude of things which must be done to build the positive peace that will give peoples everywhere the assurance of a better life with dignity, justice, and equality.

This is, as one statesman has said, the century of the common man. The valid aspirations of the oceans of common peoples of all nationalities, colors, religions and circumstances, can be achieved only in a world at peace. The common peoples of East and West, of the advanced and underdeveloped nations, instinctively want to live in a world free of conflict; but governments, influencing the thinking of citizens, stubbornly cling to the outmoded strategy of competitive power, thus dangerously postponing acceptance of the modern imperative.

IV

The awesome task in the years ahead, then, is to establish and preserve the peace until the mind of man is ready to accept the historical imperative.

Can we do it? Or I should ask, "Can you do it?" For this is the dubious legacy that my generation makes to yours.

There is a frightening irony at work here. The very scientific revolution that has created the imperative, that has provided mankind with the means to a Golden Age of Peace and Plenty, is at the same time the greatest obstacle to your achieving this objective.

As individual citizens you will find it increasingly difficult to understand and cope with the incredibly complex problems that

an onrushing era is creating. How can you be expected to understand all the facts, circumstances, and complexities of such vital issues as the depersonalization of automation, the disarray of the Atlantic Alliance, the threatening conflicts caused by divided nationals, the population explosion, the dangers of catastrophic war born of sheer religious differences, imbalances in international payments, space exploration, urban blight, civil rights, and burgeoning crime? How, indeed, can you expect your elected representatives to know enough about all of them to act wisely?

These are problems compounded exponentially by the knowledge explosion and the population explosion, and we have no infallible precedents for dealing with these unique and profound forces.

This situation can easily lead to apathy and a sense of despair. Five years ago I said: "There is a dangerous myth abroad in this land that an ordinary citizen can do nothing to influence the destiny of his country and world. I have not decided whether this is a rationalization or an epitaph."

But now, only five years later, apathy is being replaced by mass protest. Too often mass protest, by accident or design, becomes the unruly mob which senselessly defies laws and rules, and contemptuously destroys values essential to a civilized orderly society. It is but a short step from licentiousness to anarchy, and the probable, almost inevitable, cure for anarchy is dictatorship—dictatorship of the right or left.

The substitute for apathy in a world crying for peace and justice for all is not licentiousness. It is reason. As never before in our history, we now need citizens who can reason objectively, critically, and creatively within a normal framework; we need, in other words, a new breed of Americans who will devote as much time and energy to being wise democratic citizens as they do to being good physicians, engineers, or business men.

I would like to think that you and others throughout America, now in colleges and universities, or just completing collegiate and university studies, are the new Americans the world so desperately needs. I certainly pray that you are.

I close with an anecdote I have told before, for it is most relevant to the phenomenon of accelerating change and to the concept of the New American.

Destiny came down to an island many centuries ago and summoned three of its inhabitants before him.

"What would you do," Destiny asked, "if I told you that tomorrow this island would be inundated by an immense tidal wave?"

The first man, who was a cynic, said, "Why I would eat, drink, and carouse all night long."

The second man, who was a mystic, said, "I would go to the sacred groves with my loved ones and make sacrifices to the gods and pray without ceasing."

And the third man, who loved reason, thought for a while, confused and troubled, and then said, "Why I would assemble our wisest citizens and begin at once to study how to live under water."

This, with poetic license, symbolizes the challenge to you who are receiving degrees today. You must be prepared to cope with change, intelligently and unafraid. You must be prepared to deal with problems that have no precedent, to live under a tidal wave of swiftly moving and bewildering events—but always poised, free of prejudice, confident in your ability to make sound decisions, and anxious to spread man's treasured blessings to all in our own society, and throughout the world.

May you go forth from this campus with the courage, the wisdom, and the determination to meet the imperatives of your day. The hopes of mankind go with you.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON SPEAKS OUT ON VIOLENCE IN AMERICA

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, last week, President Johnson spoke to the new Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. The mandate he gave the Commission was very clearly stated in his own words:

I ask you to undertake a penetrating search for the causes and prevention of violence—a search into our National life, our past as well as our present, our traditions as well as our institutions, our culture, our customs and our laws.

To a Nation emotionally wracked in the aftermath of tragedy, the naming of the Commission by the President offers hope that America can ultimately face up to and resolve the problem of violence in our national life. The President concluded his remarks to the Commission by saying:

The agony of these past days lies heavily on the hearts of all the American people. But let us now have the will and have the purpose to forge our sorrow into a constructive force for public order and progress, for justice and compassion. This is the spirit that has sustained the Nation, and sustained it in all the years of our history.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the President's reassuring remarks in the RECORD.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO COMMISSION ON THE CAUSE AND PREVENTION OF VIOLENCE THE NATIONAL RESOLVE

This troubled world will long remember the scar of the past week's violence, but when the week is remembered, let this be remembered, too: that out of anguish came a national resolve to search for the causes and to find the cures for the outbursts of violence which have brought so much heartbreak to our Nation.

Violence has erupted in many parts of the globe, from the streets of newly emerging nations to the old cobblestones of Paris. But it is the episodes of violence in our own country which must command our attention now.

Our inquiry into that violence brings all of us together here this afternoon in the Cabinet Room at the White House. You members of this Commission come here from the church, the university, the Senate and the House, the Judiciary, the ranks of the workingman on the waterfront, and the professions.

THE SEARCH FOR CAUSES

My charge to you is simple and direct: I ask you to undertake a penetrating search for the causes and prevention of violence—a search into our national life, our past as well as our present, our traditions as well as our institutions, our culture, our customs and our laws.

I hope your search will yield:

First, an understanding and an insight into the kinds of violent aberrations which have struck down public figures and private citizens alike.

One out of every five Presidents since 1865 has been assassinated—Abraham Lincoln in April 1865, Garfield in July 1881, McKinley in September 1901, and John Fitzgerald Kennedy in November 1963.

In this same period, there have been attempts on the lives of one out of every three

of our Presidents, including President Theodore Roosevelt while campaigning in October 1912, President Franklin D. Roosevelt in February 1933, and Harry S. Truman in November 1950. In the attempt on Roosevelt's life, Mayor Anton Cermak of Chicago was killed. In the attack on President Harry Truman, a White House policeman lost his life.

The list of assassinations during the last five years is also long and shocking. Here are some of them:

In 1963: Medgar Evers, ambushed by a sniper; four Negro girls killed in a church bombing; President John F. Kennedy assassinated. 8,500 Americans were murdered that year, also, in America.

In 1964: Three civil rights workers murdered as part of a Ku Klux Klan conspiracy; Lt. Col. Lemuel Penn shot down on a highway. 9,250 Americans were murdered that year in America, also.

In 1965: Mrs. Viola Luizzo. 9,850 Americans were murdered that year in America, too.

In 1966: Malcolm "X". 10,920 Americans were murdered that year.

In 1967: George Lincoln Rockwell. 12,230 Americans were murdered that year.

In 1968: Martin Luther King, Jr. and Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

Just yesterday, the newspapers recorded that a Jordanian grocer was shot to death and police speculate that the killing may have been in revenge for the assassination of Senator Kennedy.

Second, I hope your search will uncover the causes of disrespect for law and order—disrespect for proper authority in the home and disrespect for public officials—and of violent disruptions of public order by individuals and groups.

Third, I hope your studies will lead to practical actions to control or prevent these outbreaks of violence.

VITAL QUESTIONS—NEEDED ANSWERS

Here are some of the questions I hope you will consider:

Is there something in the environment of American society or the structure of American institutions that causes disrespect for the law, that causes contempt for the rights of others, and incidents of violence? If there is, how can we correct it?

Has permissiveness toward extreme behavior in our society encouraged an increase of violence?

Why do some individuals and groups reject the peaceful political and institutional processes of change in favor of violent means?

Are the seeds of violence nurtured through the public's airwaves, the screens of neighborhood theaters, the news media, and other forms of communication from our leaders that reach the family and reach our young? I am asking the heads of the radio and television networks and the Chairman and the members of the Federal Communications Commission to cooperate wholeheartedly with this Commission.

Is violence a contagious phenomenon? To the extent that it is, are there ways we can reduce the contagion?

What is the relationship between mass disruption of public order and the individual acts of violence?

What is the relationship between mental derangement and violence—remembering that half of our hospital beds in America are now occupied by the mentally ill?

Does the democratic process which stresses exchanges of ideas permit less physical contact with masses of people—as a matter of security against the deranged individual and obsessed fanatic?

To the extent we can identify the basic causes of violence and disrespect for the law, what practical steps then can we and should we take to eliminate them?

Can our society any longer tolerate the widespread possession of deadly firearms by private citizens?

What—beyond firm and effective Federal and State gun control laws which are so desperately needed—can be done to give further protection to public leaders and to private citizens?

How can the Government at all levels, the churches, the schools and the parents help to dispel the forces that lead to violence?

ACTIONS, LAWS AND INSTITUTIONS

These are some of the questions that are on the minds of Americans today. But I will and I must leave to you the task of defining precisely the scope and boundaries of this inquiry. For you will be venturing into uncharted ground.

Some of the questions I have asked and the matters you look into may be beyond the frontiers of man's knowledge. Nevertheless, I urge you to go as far as man's knowledge takes you.

Even where basic causes are beyond the knowledge and control of man, you may still be able to propose actions and laws and institutions which can limit the opportunities for violence by individuals and groups, for as I said to the Nation only last Friday: "Two million guns were sold in the United States last year. Far too many were bought by the demented, the deranged, the hardened criminal and the convict, the addict and the alcoholic. We cannot expect these irresponsible people to be prudent in their protection of us, but we can expect the Congress to protect us from them."

"I have spoken before of the terrible toll inflicted on our people by firearms: 750,000 Americans dead since the turn of the century. This is far more than have died at the hands of our enemies in all the wars we have fought."

"Each year in this country guns are involved in more than 6,500 murders. This compares with 30 in England, 99 in Canada, 68 in West Germany, and 37 in Japan. 44,000 aggravated assaults are committed with guns in America each year. 50,000 robberies are committed with guns in America each year."

The truths we seek will yield stubbornly to search. But I do want to be sure that search is made, and that search must be started now.

Your work should help us all move toward that day when hatred and violence will have no sway in the affairs of men. Since violence is an international phenomenon, your work will be a service not only to your countrymen, but, I hope, to the world.

THE AGONY AND THE PURPOSE

The agony of these past days lies heavy on the hearts of all the American people.

But let us now have the will and have the purpose to forge our sorrow into a constructive force for public order and progress, for justice and compassion. This is the spirit that has sustained the Nation, and sustained it in all the years of our history.

This is the spirit, I believe, that can see us emerge from this hour of sorrow—and emerge as a stronger and a more unified people.

Mr. Speaker, if these seeds of hatred are leading to growing violence in our Nation—and there are ample signs of this—then we must unite as a people and root out and destroy these seeds before the disease of hatred spreads any further.

The President's action in appointing this new Commission is a hope that we will be better able to understand the causes and conditions which breed this self-destructive illness which shows itself in hatred of fellow man and lack of respect for government—for society—and for law and order.

RETIREMENT INCOME FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, there is pending before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee House Resolution 16288, authored by Chairman DULSKI, which legislation is entitled "Civil Service Retirement Modernization Act of 1968." I want to voice my wholehearted support for this legislation, and I would even go further.

Significant gains have been made in the past 20 years in employee legislation.

Twenty years ago the maximum annuity a Federal employee could receive after serving his working life was \$100 per month. This was not much in 1948; it is even less now. Over the last 20 years, the amount of possible income has increased substantially. The current maximum is 80 percent of his best 5-year average. This is reached after working for 41 years and 11 months.

We have been hearing for years that employees would like to have a 30-year retirement option with no reduction in annuity because of age. This proposal for retirement after 30 years of service is only significant and usable if the end result is satisfactory—that is, sufficient money is available to him so he can in fact retire.

The continued growth of our country, both from an industrial as well as the socioeconomic standpoint will certainly result in more leisure time for us to enjoy the fruits of our labors. The increasing engagement of our younger people in scholastic endeavors will continue to raise the entrance age of employees into Federal employment.

The President's Committee on Corporate Pension Funds and Other Private Retirement and Welfare Programs—published January 15, 1965, page 31—submitted by the Honorable W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, said:

For both economic and social reasons, the committee believes that public policy should not operate to exert undue pressure for early retirement of older workers, or, by the same token, for postponed retirement. Rather, it should seek to create conditions of free choice that will permit those who are able and who wish to keep on working to do so, while providing adequate retirement income for those who prefer to retire.

These are high sounding ideals well worth considering and, if possible, putting into action.

Let us talk about this subject in both areas of concern: First, let us examine the pressure for early retirement. The Senate has received a report—"Federal staff retirement systems," Senate Document No. 14, 90th Congress, page 34, recommendation B.2—in which the proposal is made to give agencies discretion to retire "higher level administrative and executive employees, who are eligible to retire on immediate annuity and who have at least 30 years of creditable serv-

ice." Evidently, 30 years of service is considered to be a magic number during which it is possible to gather together an estate which will supplement the retirement benefits which will be paid after 30 years of creditable service.

Let us examine the second part; that of providing "adequate retirement income for those who prefer to retire." The current law provides that the first 5 years and the second 5 years of service be calculated at 1½ percent and 1¾ percent, respectively, and 2 percent after 10 years. In 30 years this adds to 56.35 percent—7.5 plus 8.85 plus 40—of the best 5 years salary, provided, of course, an employee does not want to provide for his survivors. If he does, this annuity is further reduced. The average annuity paid in the month of March 1968 to a Federal employee was \$236.44. For the survivors, wives, children or other dependents was \$117.09. This is \$2,837.28 and \$1,405.98 per annum, respectively. The poverty levels have been fixed at much higher levels than this, much higher. If we are to provide any hope for these employees to reach a successful retirement income, a method must be created as soon as possible.

The Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees is a conservative, respected group. Their president, Les Dorson, is widely and correctly considered to be one of the greatest living authorities on civil service retirement, matching one of my own constituents in this regard, Miss Ann Krishna, of Vallejo, Calif.

Mr. Dorson has testified before the other body that an increase to 2½ percent would make sense, provide the opportunity for employees to retire with dignity, not seeking charity and welfare as they have in too many cases. The retirement rates for ourselves the Members of Congress is already this rate—should not all Federal employees have it? The members of the Retirement Federation have assured me that they are willing to share the cost of this added burden. The Civil Service Commission has indicated that the cost will approach 2.9 percent of payroll to be shared equally between the employees and the employer. This would increase our fringe benefit liability approximately 5 percent, raising it from approximately 28 percent to 29½ percent. Most progressive private firms are paying more than 35 percent of payroll for fringe benefits and these are on the increase.

The 80-percent upper limit on retirement benefit accrual should be retained, but raising the computation rate to 2½ percent per year would permit employees to retire after 32 years of service with the maximum amount. If we assume that the entrance date was 22 years, then the minimum retirement age could be fixed at 54.

There is no doubt that our dereliction of years gone by in failing to finance this retirement fund properly has caught up with us. This problem of financing must be solved and while we are solving it, we should accommodate the cost of the unfunded liability which will result from the increased benefits proposed herein.

EDUCATION SECONDARY TO INTEGRATION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the intellectual gymnastics to use human beings for experimental cattle and our educational institutions as testing laboratories never ceases amazement.

Education now is secondary—compulsory race mixing is a priority. Apparently without race mixing first there can be no time for education.

When will the social mechanics awaken that they provoke the cause and solve nothing?

I place clippings from the Post for June 19 in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, June 19, 1968]

INTEGRATION PLANS MULLED FOR SIX MARYLAND STATE COLLEGES

Maryland's six state colleges are among the most rigidly segregated schools in the State. Consultants hired by the Board of Trustees to find ways to integrate the student bodies have confirmed what was well known—that three of the colleges are virtually all white and three virtually all Negro.

In the three mainly Negro colleges, Bowie, Coppin and Morgan, only 3.2 per cent of the students are white. In the three mainly white colleges, Frostburg, Salisbury and Towson only 1.2 per cent of the students are Negro.

TOO LATE FOR BUDGET

The consultants say their study will not be finished until December, too late for the colleges to provide any related program financing in their 1969-70 budget request.

The trustees expressed concern over the segregation problem in a meeting this week at Frostburg State College in Northwest Maryland. No decisions were made except to schedule a meeting of an appropriate committee.

Several of the colleges recently submitted suggestions for increasing integration. The most concrete proposal has come from Morgan State, most prestigious of the six colleges.

Morgan President Martin Jenkins suggested a plan for the three state colleges in the Baltimore area. All Morgan and Coppin students (mainly Negroes) would be required during their college careers to take three or four courses at Towson. All Towson students (mainly whites) would be required to do the same at Morgan or Coppin.

"I am convinced that racial integration of the student bodies of the state colleges in the Baltimore area will not occur on an entirely voluntary basis," Jenkins wrote.

DEvised BY STUDENTS, FACULTY

The cross-registration plan actually was devised by a student-faculty committee at Morgan, which consulted with a similar committee at Towson.

A sign of the difficulties involved in integration was reported by Frostburg President John Morey, who was host for this week's trustee meeting.

In line with the goal of integration, Morey said, his college recently required that all owners of off-campus student housing must pledge not to discriminate against students on grounds of race, creed or religion.

So many of the landlords formerly listed by the college rejected the pledge, Morey reported, that the college now faces a shortage of living accommodations for 90 students this fall.

[From the Washington Post, June 19, 1968]
BOARDS TOLD OF URBAN SCHOOL NEED

Bennetta B. Washington, wife of Mayor Walter E. Washington and director of the women's Job Corps yesterday told members of big-city school boards that the poor people need food not only for their bodies, but also for their minds.

"We haven't the time to risk educational starvation," she said at a luncheon meeting of the Council of Big City Boards of Education, held at the Hotel America.

She said the school boards and their communities must help give the urban poor a "rich intellectual diet," and must nourish the aspirations, dreams and self-confidence of the students.

Improvements that would help do this must not wait until increased appropriations for schools are passed, she said. "Only if we provide fundamental changes in education can we look forward with confidence to the future," she added.

During their three-day meeting the school board members talked with Federal officials and members of Congress about obtaining more money to support urban education.

They adopted a resolution urging the Federal Government to pay big cities a \$1000 grant for each low-rent public housing unit within the city, and that these funds be used to support education.

[From the Washington Post, June 19, 1968]
COUNCIL APPROVES A BUDGET INCREASE—
HUMAN RELATIONS PANEL DUE EXTRA
\$334,000 IN FISCAL 1969

(By Hollie West)

The City Council last night approved a \$549,000 request for an increase in the fiscal 1969 budget, more than half of which would finance an enlargement of the Council on Human Relations.

The Council's staff would be enlarged from 8 to 51 members and its functions would break down into five divisions: office of executive director; education and program development; research and statistics; enforcement, and community relations. A total of \$334,000 of the proposed budget was earmarked for the revamping.

Congressional approval of the request is required.

Of the \$549,000, \$150,000 would be spent in the reallocation of laborer positions within the public school system, where 584 employees are scheduled to be reclassified to higher levels.

The balance of the increase requested last night, \$65,000, would go to the Washington Convention and Visitors Bureau, bringing to \$200,000 the city's contribution to the Bureau's work of attracting tourists. The balance of the Bureau's annual expenditure is financed from contributions by the business community.

The City Council also voted an amendment to the alcoholic beverage regulations, easing the credit restrictions on retail liquor dealers. They must pay for their stocks within 60 days or face action by the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board, which could result in license suspension.

The amendment represented an attempt to put dealers who were heaviest hit in the April riots back on their financial feet by allowing them to finance restocking over a 12-month period.

The Council also passed some revised construction safety standards which provide, among other things, for mandatory daily safety inspections and reports and a set of uniform requirements for concrete form work. The revision also provides for a standardized fencing off of construction sites and more rigid safety inspections of working cranes.

Also approved was a change in the Northwest Urban Renewal Plan No. 1 which would permit the erection of a 200-bed, limited-

care nursing home for the elderly at 1st and K Streets n.w., originally set aside for residential construction.

[From the Washington Post, June 19, 1968]

MOTHERS WELCOME WELFARE DECISION

City welfare recipients yesterday welcomed the Supreme Court decision that overturned the "man-in-the-house" rule and said the ruling would mean more stable family lives for children on relief.

Several welfare recipients said the end of the rule would aid welfare mothers' chances of getting married and leaving the relief rolls.

The rule, which cut off aid to children when a man lived in their home or acted as their "substitute parent," meant that many women were denied relationships leading to marriage, the recipients said.

Monday's high court decision voiding Alabama's man-in-the-house rule will also affect similar rules here and in 18 other states.

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare announced it is preparing new regulations to prevent states from refusing aid to children who have a "substitute parent," a man who is not their natural or adoptive father, in the home.

Aid can apparently still be denied to a family with an able-bodied natural or adoptive father who is legally responsible for the children's support.

The District Welfare Department has asked the District corporation counsel for an opinion on the impact of the Supreme Court's ruling on the city's "substitute-parent" and "man-in-the-house" rules.

Deputy Welfare Director Albert P. Russo said the Department was aware, however, of HEW's intention to issue regulations invalidating the policies on "substitute parents."

The result here would be more persons coming on to the relief rolls and fewer being dropped, Russo said.

Abolition of the local policy would not mean the end of the city's large-scale welfare investigation program, Russo said.

Investigators would still be required to review public-assistance cases to get facts on financial resources, family composition and living arrangements, he said.

Russo said there was no question that abolition of the rule would have an effect on the Department's investigative program.

"The Department would need to review its investigative program in light of the continuing congressional mandate to review and reinvestigate public-assistance cases," he said.

Russo pointed out that the detection of an unrelated male in a welfare mother's home does not rule out public aid here.

When cases involving aid to families with dependent children are closed because a man is found in the home, he said, caseworkers are instructed to notify the man that he and the family are eligible for up to six months of temporary assistance while he awaits job training.

REMARKS OF LISLE CARTER, JR.

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on August 17, 1967, I introduced H.R. 12461, a bill to establish a national program of monthly children's allowances.

This was the first bill of its kind to be introduced into the Congress in its history. The Library of Congress has done a magnificent job of compiling a history

of this type of legislation and I recommend it to all interested persons.

In the meanwhile, however, Mr. Lisle C. Carter, Jr., in a statement recently made to the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy of the Joint Economic Committee, has made a great contribution in this direction. His statements are some of the clearest and best put on the subject matter I have seen. I was criticized by some most severely for proposing this legislation, but I was in dead earnest as I presently am. I have the secure satisfaction of knowing that sooner or later this type of proposal will be most seriously considered, and perhaps even adopted.

Under unanimous consent I place in the RECORD the testimony of Mr. Carter:

STATEMENT BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISCAL POLICY OF THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE BY LISLE C. CARTER, JR., FORMER ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE FOR INDIVIDUAL AND FAMILY SERVICES

Madam Chairman, Members of the Subcommittee: Thank you for inviting me to appear before you to discuss the existing welfare system and to look at directions which this system and other income maintenance programs should take in the future. It is my understanding that I am invited to testify not as a representative of the Urban Coalition but as an individual based on my previous service as Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In any event, let me say for the record that the views which I shall present are my own and not necessarily those of the Urban Coalition.

I want to commend you for holding these well planned public hearings on welfare and income maintenance. This is a subject which is much discussed today but very little understood. There are an awful lot of myths and misinformation about existing welfare programs and about the poor, which can only get in the way of serious efforts to examine the contribution which income maintenance programs can make to solve the problem of poverty. There needs to be informed and wide public debate. This is the only way in which significant changes in social policy requiring commitment of substantial resources are likely to be made and sustained. For this reason I think it is unfortunate that so much of the discussions affecting policy in this area have been carried on behind closed doors between a relatively small number of members of Congress and representatives of the Executive Branch. It does not matter whether the results of these discussions are sometimes beneficial, as in the case of the medical program, or retrogressive, as in the case of the 1967 Public Assistance "Freeze" and Compulsory Work Program. Whatever may be the case with relatively small, incremental changes, where major policy or program changes are made without full debate they are not likely to find broad acceptance, and I say this without regard to which side one comes down on in the particular issue. I for one regret the restrictions that have now been imposed on the original medical program, and at the same time feel strongly that the "Freeze" in the Aid to Families with Dependent Children and the Compulsory Work amendments must be repealed before discussion of improvements in the program can be taken seriously. But I believe that in both cases there should have been full and open debate before such far reaching amendments were enacted.

Before turning to my views as to what should be done it may be helpful to outline briefly the context of our considerations.

There are four major Federally-supported public assistance programs generally grouped together as welfare aiding approximately 7 1/2 million persons. There are another 600,000

persons supported by local general assistance and relief programs. Of the Federal recipients, approximately 3 million are recipients under the three adult programs—Aid to the Blind, Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled, and Old-Age Assistance.

The rest—almost 5 million persons, of whom somewhat over one million are adults—receive Aid to Families with Dependent Children, or AFDC.

Trends in adult Federal assistance programs show a decline in recipient rates, with one exception. The declines in adult categories are largely attributable to the development of other sources of support and protection, specifically a broadening of social security benefits. The slight rise in aid to the disabled is generally attributed to the case-finding effects of Medicaid. The number of AFDC recipients, however, has risen sharply. The increase in FY 1967 over 1966 was 319,000, and, for FY 1968, the increase over 1967 is estimated to be 436,000.

Despite dramatic rises in the number of AFDC recipients, the program does not come close to reaching all those poor who are categorically eligible—that is, children in families with a parent dead, absent from the home, disabled or—in some States—unemployed. For example, in 1965, 55 percent of those categorically eligible for AFDC did not receive assistance and the number has risen since then.

What is perhaps even more significant is that these 8 million welfare recipients represent only approximately one-fourth of persons living in poverty, as it is currently defined. While the welfare population is a heavily dependent group: the aged, children and youth, the handicapped, the poor population has a different character. If we exclude the 5 million aged poor, the bulk of the 27 million non-aged poor live in families with a breadwinner who works at a job all or part of the year.

In 1965, 70 percent of non-aged poor families were headed by men, of whom nearly 50 percent held full-time jobs and 86 percent worked at least part-time. Thus, the typical poor family is not only headed by a man, but a family in which the man holds down a full-time job. The typical poor family, in other words, resembles the typical American family.

These able-bodied poor and their families have historically been excluded from public assistance programs. Thus, it should be clear that the present system is not broad enough to include a wide range of persons of great need. It should be equally clear that the present system also fails to adequately meet the needs of those who do participate.

Dissatisfaction with welfare, and especially with AFDC, is universal. It is regarded by people on welfare as demeaning, incentive-destroying, and inadequate. The non-welfare poor seem to have mixed feelings—both resentment and pride—because they do their best to make it and do not get any help from anyone. And many of the non-poor seem to feel they are supporting the unworthy and undeserving in a shiftless way of life.

Society, on the other hand, is relatively generous in its financial aids to those it deems deserving and proffers this aid without taint or stigma. Veterans' allowances, social security payments, income tax benefits, unemployment compensation, and the like are regarded as rights to which beneficiaries are entitled, earned through the performance of service or through actual purchase, or because of some special status. There is no such legitimacy—no earned right—which justifies welfare payments in the minds of most Americans.

The priorities of the Federal government are reflected in the existence of categorical programs for the aged, blind, disabled, and dependent children, and the level of support

for each. It is no coincidence that the aged, blind, and disabled have led the way in our current cash assistance programs since in some sense, these groups have been considered the most "worthy" of support. Children have been less well treated because some of those who are (or might be) eligible for assistance are needy for reasons which are apparently less acceptable to the majority of citizens or their representatives. These reasons mostly have to do with parents and not with children; e.g., inability to earn a decent wage, unemployment, absence of the father (for whatever reason—death, divorce, desertion), or because the children themselves were born out of wedlock.

Studies have shown that welfare recipients also tend to feel that receiving welfare is a privilege which requires them to relinquish some of their individual rights in order to obtain support from society. Welfare programs tend to place recipients in a different class both in their own eyes and the eyes of the larger community. Welfare seems to reinforce the alienation and the low self-esteem that is common among the poor. Even the services offered to recipients of welfare reinforce their isolation in the narrow restrictive manner in which they are offered.

While it is obvious that having the program as we now know it is much better than having no program, steps must be taken to eliminate some of the more offensive elements of public assistance programs and to broaden the program realistically to include the many more who need assistance.

There are several basic reforms in the existing programs which I believe to be essential. None of these are original with me.

First, we need a national standard for minimum payments. Payment levels in most states are very low, in most cases below the minimum subsistence levels States themselves define and below the poverty level. For a woman on AFDC who has three children, for example, 14 states provide \$1 per person per day or less to meet all needs. It is obvious that a level of payment must be set and payments made on the basis of a national standard.

Last year the Administration proposed that states be required at least to meet their own minimum subsistence standards and this first step toward a national minimum standard was rejected even though it permitted, in my view, too much variance among the states.

As a second necessary reform, I believe that persons should be eligible for welfare on the basis of need and on no other basis. Arbitrary considerations about who should and should not be permitted to participate in the program should be banned. Eligibility would be established by a simple declaration of need for support. Use of declarations would imply that we trust poor people as much as we trust the non-poor to declare annually accurate statements of income for tax purposes. The system could be monitored as the tax system is—by random sample checks. This would have the additional virtue of simplifying the administration of the welfare system.

As another improvement I would like to propose that we separate welfare services from money assistance. Some persons need the services which the welfare program offers while others need only the money. We should get away from treating those who are on welfare as "cases." The services provided by welfare should not be forced on those persons who neither desire nor need them.

A final point is that adults in AFDC families are allowed no earned exemptions under the program as it now stands. This lack of incentive to work is a serious short-coming of the welfare system. Until quite recently the mother who supplemented her AFDC payments with some meager earnings would find her grant diminished by that amount. Now a third of her earnings may be exempted

in calculating her monthly payment—but it is questionable that this is adequate.

There are several other valuable changes which I have not cited that could be made, such as the involvement of recipients in program operation and policy making. While all of these changes which I have discussed would make for a more efficient and humane welfare program it is my view that the current program—or even the program with the changes I've proposed is not designed to and cannot fill the income gap between the poor, the near poor and the affluent in our society. It is too stigmatized and has too many built in handicaps for this kind of expansion. What is needed is a combination of approaches which will be flexible enough to meet the differing needs of individuals and families at different times.

In my view we ought to be considering ways of maintaining welfare as a residual program while continually shrinking its population. There have been many suggestions put forth as to how this can be done—negative income tax, guaranteed public employment, expanded social security benefits and children's allowances—are among them.

No one of these programs by itself is the complete answer. All of these proposals as well as others will be described and discussed by the experts who will testify before you. I'd like to, however, offer to you for your consideration my view as to the most desirable combination of approaches.

First, we should have a program of guaranteed public employment. Such a program would offer opportunities for useful work to those whose skills do not qualify them for jobs on the market now. For much of our history we have relied on the relatively secure unskilled or semi-skilled job to provide the base from which poor families could advance to a better level of living. Those jobs no longer exist in any significant numbers. Therefore it should be the responsibility of the public sector to replace this entry door to the main society. Jobs could be created to fill the wide variety of unmet needs in areas such as education, health, public safety, sanitation and other municipal services. The National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress estimated that there are 5.3 million potential jobs in public service.

However, even with an effective public service employment program, we still will not have closed the difference between a worker's productive capacity and the cycle of his family needs.

The United States is the only Western country which has not recognized this discontinuity and provided for it by means of a children's allowance. Canada, for example, has provided for such an allowance for more than twenty years.

Simply stated, a children's allowance provides payments to all families with dependent children for the purpose of promoting the welfare of children and strengthening family life. A children's allowance program has several virtues, other than the above mentioned one which makes it particularly relevant to the characteristics of the poor in the United States.

First, it would directly benefit the group which as we have seen is most needy.

Second, a children's allowance would benefit this group without providing disincentives to work. This is because the children's allowance is not reduced with earnings. As most of the poor in this group live in families in which the head is employed, the absence of disincentive is particularly important. A children's allowance program might, in fact, provide a positive incentive to work. With an assured income from a children's allowance and no tax until total income exceeds the poverty line, a poor family can lift itself from poverty with only a modest earned income.

Third, children's allowances will benefit the near poor and, indeed children at all

income levels where the family income is strained because of the stage of life where children are, illness and so forth. In particular, it will have the effect of easing the strain that young families at almost all income levels feel in the early years of marriage. Because money going to the non poor would in this manner play a specifically constructive role in family development, we do not regard it as wasted, even though it does not meet our primary objective. Moreover these payments should help to reduce tensions between poor and near poor, because it provides benefits to both. I should not need to belabor that in these times we should look with favor on any thing that reduce divisiveness.

Fourth, a children's allowance also would be amenable to simple and dignified administration.

Finally, a children's allowance will increase the capacity of low- and low-middle income families to provide achievement opportunities for their children.

To a limited extent, national policy already recognizes the differential between wages and family need by supplementing family income through our system of income tax exemptions. At a minimum tax rate of 14 percent, a family gains \$98 in net income per child; the amount of the benefit increases at each tax level so that those families earning the most benefit the most. Families that have incomes too low to be taxed are excluded entirely from the benefit.

This combination of guaranteed public employment and a children's allowance would take most of the persons we have described as "poor" out of poverty. To guard against disability, age and other predictable contingencies we should expand social security coverage. This would leave a radically improved public assistance program as a last resort for those who fall between the cracks of these other programs.

But before any major income maintenance programs are enacted—or even seriously proposed—the American people will have to know a good deal more about them and the need for them. At the present time there is no more than a handful of people in this country who understand questions you will be discussing or who have given them any thought at all.

Throughout this week many different points of view as to how to assure minimum income to our citizens will be presented to you. While I favor the approach I have outlined, the most important thing is not to lose ourselves in debate among various plans, but to get the American people to recognize the great need which exists and the requirement to commit substantial resources to eradicate the need. Yet the time is very, very short and we must find ways to convey effectively the urgency and extent of the need. I believe these hearings will serve as a most useful contribution to this end.

WHO IS HE?

HON. DELBERT L. LATTI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following poem received from Cpl. Ron Cain and servicemen of the 2d Battalion, 1st Marine Regiment, H&S Co., serving in Vietnam:

WHO IS HE?

You sit at home and watch TV,
You're sipping a refreshing, cold iced tea.
The news comes on and then you hear,
The all-star game is drawing near.

Then you see a far-off land,
Where men are dying in the sand.
A frown appears across your face,
You're tired of hearing about that place.

Who cares about Vietnam across the sea,
It's far away and doesn't concern me.
You'd rather hear the Beatles play,
Than learn about the world today.

But stop and think for a moment or two,
And ask yourself, "Does this concern you?"
It's great to be alive and free,
But what about the guy across the sea.

He's giving up his life for me,
So that I can live under liberty.
He's far away fighting a war,
Instead of fighting at my front door.

This guy who lives in filth and slime,
How can he do it all the time?
He's about my age, so why should I care
About a war someone else should share.

You call him vile names and make fun of
his cause,
Yet he's always first to win your wars.
You lucky guy, you laugh and sneer
Because you've never really known fear.

This young man faces death each day,
But he always has something funny to say.
"No mall again!" (a time for sorrow)
"Oh, what the hell, there's always tomorrow."

His morale is low, the tension is high,
Some men even break down and cry.
He waits to go home and see a loved one,
For this soldier is someone's son.

You don't appreciate what he will do,
Like giving up his life for you.
He sacrifices much, yet asks nothing in
return,
Just so you can sit in school and learn.

No parties and dances for this young man,
Until he comes back home again.
The days are hot and the nights are too,
What wonder a cold beer could do.

He dreams of girls and thick juicy steaks,
When someone shouts, "We've got a hill to
take."

Some will be heroes because they are brave,
And others will get a wreath on their grave.

You'll recognize him as he walks by,
There's a saddened look in his eye.
He walks so proud yet looks so mean,
He's called the world's greatest fighting
machine.

He's a *United States Marine!*

OUTSTANDING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER RECOGNIZED

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, based on the headlines, the news casts and more specifically on literally thousands of letters I have received in the last few months, it is easy to conclude that among many Americans there has been a loss of faith in the ability of government at all levels to maintain law and order. We hear about inefficient and ineffective police forces and we seem to incline ourselves toward the proposition that our law enforcement agencies are second rate.

Mr. Speaker, though I will not argue the fact that there is room for improvement in our law enforcement system, I am unwilling to generalize the point that all law enforcement agencies leave much

to be desired. Specifically, Mr. Speaker, I have in mind the Maryland State Police. This organization is composed of highly competent professionals whose capabilities are matched by their dedication, and who serve the people of Maryland in the finest tradition.

Typical of the professionalism and competence of the Maryland State Police is Maj. Paul J. Randall. Major Randall entered the Maryland Force in 1933. He served with mounted units when the horse was an important adjunct to police work. He progressed through the units employing the motorcycle and automobile. In 1949 he was appointed captain of his troop. These were pioneer days in law enforcement and the formative stages of the now very complex programs and procedures employed in police work. Major Randall has played no small part in the development of the techniques required by modern day law enforcement.

In 1955, Major Randall left his local station on the Eastern Shore of Maryland for assignment and training in the State headquarters in Pikesville. He returned as commander of the Eastern Shore detachment in 1959. During his busy career, which includes a recent election as Delmarva Policeman of the Year, he has found time to become heavily involved in extracurricular activities and civic responsibilities.

Now he goes back to the headquarters as a senior commander of the entire Maryland force. In this new responsibility he has the very best wishes of all of us who know him and appreciate his complete dedication to the people of his State and to his service.

Mr. Speaker, I bring this matter to the attention of my colleagues in the House, because I feel all too often and particularly in these critical times, the worth and work of men like Major Randall throughout this country, have not been full recognized or adequately appreciated. I urge my colleagues to support in every way the members of their State police organizations throughout the country. Let us make sure that they have capable men, properly and fairly compensated, and adequate equipment to do the job which lies before them.

Mr. Speaker, as long as our State and local police forces are able to perform in a superior manner we will never face the necessity or even the consideration of establishing a national police force which, in itself, would be a tragic thrust against the very core of this Republic.

WHAT IS HAPPENING?

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, a number of editors in the Second Congressional District of Minnesota have been reprinting a most thoughtful editorial by Sander Olson, editor of the St. Peter Herald, St. Peter, Minn. Mr. Olson's views about the reasons behind increased violence in America should, indeed, receive wider circulation, and I include his editorial

for the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

WHAT IS HAPPENING?

If there is a question being asked around this globe following the shooting of Senator Robert Kennedy, it must be this... "My God, what is happening to America?"

It is not only a cry of shocked reaction, it is a question for which Americans had better seek an answer.

With all the cries of "police state tactics" and "police brutality" emanating from riot-torn college campuses, Americans might well be asking this day if, in fact, we are capable of imposing upon ourselves enough law and order.

We are living in an age of permissiveness... and we have reaped another harvest of tragedy.

From... of all places... the pulpits of the land, we have been hearing the men of God proclaiming we each should let our conscience govern our actions. We've been pointing that theme into our young.

Someone let his own conscience be his guide in California Tuesday night. Someone else let his own conscience govern his actions in Memphis, and another in Dallas.

Somehow or other we have lost in America the balance between freedom of action and the self-imposed discipline of rule by law. It's not more laws we need... we have a proliferation of laws and regulations in every aspect of our lives, to the degree almost where we cannot move without violating some fiat.

We have, in fact, learned to live with violations of the law. We bend it a little when we make out income tax returns... we cheat the law rather frequently when we drive automobiles... as one friend said this week, we cannot even go duck hunting for a little relaxation without coming back a law violator because of the literal flood of regulations.

The United States Supreme Court, bent on protecting the rights of the individual, has endangered the rights of society.

We have let violence and riot and rash action become viable political forces in the land. We have had law enforcement officers, on national television, stand by and watch privately owned stores in our nation's capital be looted by mobs... in the name of some hazy socio-economic principle that "it is better to let them loot" than to suppress them in the name of property rights.

We have been in short, breeding violent action and reaction as a part of American life.

It seems to us that this nation had better start turning some serious attention away from its adopted role as guardian and banker of the world toward the anarchy which is threatening from within.—SANDER OLSON in the St. Peter Herald.

PEPPER: GREAT AMERICAN

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with great pleasure a magnificent tribute to our distinguished colleague, the Honorable CLAUDE PEPPER. I am particularly impressed because it is carried in one of Florida's better newspapers, the Panama City News-Herald, in my district. The editorial is from the pen of Mike Darley, one of Florida's top newspapermen and a great advocate of progress.

The editorial follows:

CXIV—1130—Part 14

[From the Panama City (Fla.) News-Herald, June 16, 1968]

PEPPER: GREAT AMERICAN

Claude Denson Pepper, the noble old Roman of the United States Congress, just keeps on improving with age.

Now approaching 68 and rounding out his third term in Congress from the 11th District of Florida (the North Miami area), Pepper is a powerful voice in Washington—and with good reason. He served with distinction for 16 years in the United States Senate before being defeated for reelection in 1950.

The years have been kind to Pepper. We had dinner with him on a recent trip to Washington and it was rewarding to see that the distinguished old scrapper still has his physical strength, along with one of the finest minds in the country. We thoroughly enjoyed the several hours spent with this great American.

Besides being one of the real giants in the Senate during the years when that august body was filled with men of great stature, Pepper was the right hand of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and helped draft some of the legislation that pulled this country out of the throes of the harshest depression it ever has known.

Pepper always has been a great champion of the aged, the poor, the infirm and the down-trodden, and he shows no signs of ever changing. Although the shadows of his life are lengthening, he still is an avid reformist for social changes that will benefit the less fortunate.

Pepper pioneered most of our national medical legislation and he was advocating Medicare a quarter century before it became a reality. As a matter of fact, it was his strong stand for federal medical assistance for the aged that cost him his Senate seat. The medical lobby went all out to defeat him in his bid for re-election in 1950.

Despite the political setback, Claude Pepper never has compromised his stand. He is a real standup man in a world where there are few such persons. Because of his great courage, Pepper is universally respected, even by those who disagree with him. He is a dedicated humanitarian who works hard to make this world a better place in which to live.

Pepper is one of the few persons in America who deliberately prepared himself for service in the senate. A native of Dudleyville, Ala., he attended the University of Alabama and went on to take his law degree from Harvard. A brilliant attorney, Pepper taught law briefly at the University of Arkansas before coming to Florida in the mid twenties.

During these early years of his life, Pepper had but one thought in mind—preparing himself for service in the Senate.

Pepper always has had a strong affinity and close ties with Northwest Florida. He began his Florida law practice in Perry and moved to Tallahassee after being elected to the state legislature. He enjoys visiting this area of the state immensely and comes here whenever the opportunity avails itself.

Claude Pepper made a name for himself in the United States Senate as a scholarly liberal, a student of world affairs. He served for many years on the important Foreign Relations Committee and tried to steer this country on a peaceful course following World War II. The medical lobby rewarded him for his efforts by branding him a communist when he ran for re-election in 1950.

Nothing could be farther from the truth. Claude Pepper is a liberal, yes, but an American first—and a very patriotic one. He served his country in World War I and always has been a great champion of America.

Pepper is proud of being a progressive liberal, but he is not a liberal in the sense that the meaning of the word being maligned by a new breed who call themselves liberals.

We are referring to the peaceniks, beatniks, revolutionaries, anarchists and other such enemies of America.

Claude Pepper wants to build a better America, not destroy what we already have. He believes in improving on what we already have through constructive legislation on the national level. The master lawmaker deplores the violence and demonstrations that are sweeping the nation. The noble old Roman believes in America first and he fights continuously to keep this country first.

It was a great personal victory for Claude Pepper when he was returned to the United States Congress in 1962 as representative of Florida's 11th District. It also was a great day for America, for Claude Denson Pepper is truly a great American.

COMMUNIST PERFDY IN VIETNAM IS OLD STORY FIRST CITED BY DR. TOM DOOLEY IN 1954

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the recent tragic assassination of Senator Robert Kennedy has graphically brought home to the American people the brutal reality of the evil of violence. In a land which prides itself on the rule of law, it is difficult at first to realize that our citizens are not immune to such a danger. Consequently, it is harder for us to firmly grasp the fact that violence in its many forms is almost a way of life in countries such as Vietnam. For instance, just today the Chicago Tribune carried an item on civilians killed in Vietnam in which it is stated:

Since the beginning of the year terrorists have killed more than 2,200 civilians, wounded more than 4,700 and abducted 3,700 others, Vietnamese police officials said.

And what is more shocking is the fact that these figures do not include "civilians killed in the fighting or during the Vietcong's Tet offensive in February."

Despite the accounts from the press such as the one mentioned above, some citizens still cannot see why the United States is in Vietnam. Still others label the United States as immoral because we have come to the assistance of the South Vietnamese people. I realize that for some doubters the only way they can be shocked into reality is to be a witness to such atrocities as the Dakson massacre which took place last December in Vietnam. Two battalions of Vietcong systematically killed 252 civilians with flamethrowers and grenades with approximately 70 percent of the victims being women and children.

One American citizen who had no doubts about the unbelievable brutality of the Vietnamese Communists was the late Dr. Tom Dooley who was in Vietnam at the time of the Geneva agreement in 1954. As a young doctor he served in the staging area for the evacuation of those people in the north who preferred exile in South Vietnam to life under the Communists. He described his initial reaction to his first case of Communist bestiality thus:

Inside that hut I had just seen a masterpiece of systematic torture. Under the sky, I retched and vomited my insides out. I was grateful that no one followed me; they understood and were patient.

The above quote is from his first book, "Deliver Us From Evil," and appears in the chapter, "Communist Reeducation." So appalling were his experiences at that time that Dr. Dooley felt compelled to make public the brutality inflicted on the innocent Vietnamese people:

The purpose of this book is not to sicken anyone or to dwell upon the horror of oriental tortures. But I do want to show what has come upon these people of the delta. And justice demands that some of the atrocities we learned of in Haiphong be put on record.

Now, 14 years later, the record is voluminous of the calculated, planned violence visited upon innocent Vietnamese people, and yet there are those who will not see.

To further fulfill Dr. Thomas A. Dooley's wish, and to demonstrate to the American people the heinous nature of the enemy we all face, I include the above-mentioned chapter in the RECORD at this point:

CHAPTER XV—COMMUNIST REEDUCATION

The children of Vietnam become old very young. They are mature and grave while still in early adolescence, and they are often very brave.

A number of them worked for us in the camps, staying on for months. They did adult work, accepted adult responsibilities; when they could bum cigarettes, they even smoked like adults. Yet they were only 8 or 10 or 12 years old.

Each of my corpsmen had six or seven such young assistants. The badge of honor was a white sailor hat. A retinue of them followed me around day and night, sometimes to my embarrassment. They might come to me and lead me to a feeble old woman who could not leave her tent, or take me to see a man who was crippled. They would run errands for me, fetch things I wanted, boil water for the sick-call tent. Sometimes they did my laundry, but on such occasions they were apt to wash the clothes in a rice paddy, and the wrong paddy at that, so I discouraged this. And sometimes they would ride my truck just for the fun of it, as children should.

During the months when I was living in Haiphong hotels, they would sleep outside my door. They were often the go-betweens when newly arrived escapees needed help immediately.

Whenever Mr. Ham or any other Vietnamese official wanted to see me, he would spot one of these kids with the sailor hats, or one of the shoeshine boys, and tell him to "find the Bac Sy My."

When one of my assistants would leave for the south we would hold a little ceremony. Various ships' officers had given me their ensigns' bars. So, on the official day, the Quan Hi, or lieutenant, would commission his assistant a Quan Mot or ensign in the U.S. Navy. A bar was pinned on him and his sense of self-importance increased so you could notice it. I hope the Personnel Department of the Navy will be understanding when it hears about my unusual recruiting service.

The Viet Minh directed much of their propaganda at the children and adolescents of the nation, and they went to unbelievable lengths to drive the propaganda home. The first time I ever saw the results of a Communist "reeducation" class was during the month of December. What had been done to those children one December afternoon was the most heinous thing I had ever heard of.

Having set up their controls in the village of Haiduong, Communists visited the village schoolhouse and took seven children out of class and into the courtyard. All were ordered to sit on the ground, and their hands and arms were tied behind their backs. Then they brought out one of the young teachers, with hands also tied. Now the new class began.

In a voice loud enough for the other children still in the classroom to hear, the Viet Minh accused these children of treason. A patriot had informed the police that this teacher was holding classes secretly, at night, and that the subject of these classes was religion. They had even been reading the catechism.

The Viet Minh accused the seven of conspiring because they had listened to the teachings of this instructor. As a punishment they were to be deprived of their hearing. Never again would they be able to listen to the teachings of evil men.

Now two Viet Minh guards went to each child and one of them firmly grasped the head between his hands. The other then rammed a wooden chopped chopstick into each ear. He jammed it in with all his force. The stick split the ear canal wide and tore the ear drum. The shrieking of the children was heard all over the village.

Both ears were stabbed in this fashion. The children screamed and wrestled and suffered horribly. Since their hands were tied behind them, they could not pull the wood out of their ears. They shook their heads and squirmed about, trying to make the sticks fall out. Finally they were able to dislodge them by scraping their heads against the ground.

As for the teacher, he must be prevented from teaching again. Having been forced to witness the atrocity performed on his pupils, he endured a more horrible one himself. One soldier held his head while another grasped the victim's tongue with a crude pair of pliers and pulled it far out. A third guard cut off the tip of the teacher's tongue with his bayonet. Blood spurted into the man's mouth and gushed from his nostrils onto the ground. He could not scream; blood ran into his throat. When the soldiers let him loose he fell to the ground vomiting blood; the scent of blood was all over the courtyard.

Yet neither the teacher nor any of the pupils died.

When news of this atrocity came across the Bamboo Curtain, arrangements were made for escape, and soon teacher and pupils were in tent 130 at Camp de la Pagode.

We treated the victims as well as we could, though this was not very well. I was able to pull the superior and inferior surfaces of the tongue together and close over the raw portions. The victim had lost a great deal of blood and, as we had no transfusion setup, all I could do was to give him fluids by mouth. He could not eat anything solid, not even rice. For the children, prevention of infection was the important thing. Penicillin took care of this, but nothing could give them back their hearing.

The purpose of this book is not to sicken anyone or to dwell upon the horror of Oriental tortures, which we recall from World War II and from Korea. But I do want to show what has come upon these people of the Delta. And justice demands that some of the atrocities we learned of in Haiphong be put on record.

One midnight, shortly before Christmas, I was awakened by knocking on my hotel door. Two young boys asked if Bay Sy My would please go with them right away. I thought they were from the camp, and that there was something there that needed my attention. So I quickly dressed and went out to the truck. As we were heading out the road, the children motioned for me to turn off onto a path running between two rice paddies. I didn't understand, but they were so earnest that I followed their directions.

We turned and drove several hundred yards to a straw pailote, or round hut-like building.

I bent, entered the low door, and then noticed first how dark it was and second how unexpectedly large it was inside. There was a kerosene lamp burning in one part of the hut and near it were several kneeling figures—an old man, an old woman, several boys—chanting prayers in a quiet monotone.

They greeted me with "Chao ong, Bac Sy My," clasping their hands before them and bowing their heads, in the Oriental fashion. Then I saw that there was a man lying on a straw mattress which in turn was atop eight or nine long pieces of bamboo, making a crude stretcher. His face was twisted in agony and his lips moved silently as though he were praying, as indeed he was.

When I pulled back the dirty blanket that was over him, I found that his body was a mass of blackened flesh from the shoulders to the knees. The belly was hard and distended and the scrotum swollen to the size of a football. The thighs were monstrously distorted. It was one of the most grisly sights I had ever seen. The idea of merely touching this man was repugnant.

I felt queasy, knew I was going to be sick and rushed outside. Inside that hut I had just seen a masterpiece of systematic torture. Under the sky, I retched and vomited my insides out. I was grateful that no one followed me; they understood and were patient.

I am not sure how long it took for me to get hold of myself, but I finally regained enough nerve and stability to go back and care for this human nightmare. But what could I do? For his pain I could give him morphine. For the belly I could do little, as the skin was not broken in more than four or five spots. All the bleeding was subcutaneous, in bruises which were turning a purple-yellow. I put a large needle into the scrotum in an attempt to drain out some of the fluid. Later I would insert a catheter into the bladder so that the patient could urinate. What else could I do?

I asked the old woman what on God's earth had happened to this poor human being. She told me.

He was her brother, a priest, from the parish of Vinh Bao, just on the other side of the Bamboo Curtain. Vinh Bao was not more than 10 kilometers away from Haiphong.

The area had been in Viet Minh hands for only about 7 months and the Viets had not yet completely changed the pattern of village life. The priest was permitted to continue celebrating mass, but only between 6 and 7 o'clock in the morning. This was the time when most of the peasants were just ready to start the morning's work and, under Communist rule, this was the hour when people had to gather in the village square for a daily lecture on the glories of the "new life."

This meant that they were unable to attend the parish priest's mass either daily or on Sunday. So, for the few who dared to risk his services, the valiant 57-year-old priest held them in the evening. The Communists decided that he needed reeducation.

Late the night before, Communist soldiers had called at the priest's chapel, accused him of holding secret meetings and ordered him to stop. Defiantly he replied that nothing could stop him from preaching the word of God. And so this is what they did: they hung him by his feet from one of the crude wooden beams under the ceiling. His head was so close to the ground that he later said, "Frequently, I would place my hands on the ground to try to take the pressure off my feet."

With short, stout bamboo rods they proceeded to beat the "evil" out of him. They went on for hours; he did not know just how long. They concentrated on the most sensitive parts of the anatomy. "The pain was great," the priest said. It must have been very great indeed.

He was left hanging in the church, and

early the next morning his altar boys found him there and managed to cut him down. They were only 8 to 10 years old, and they ran to their parents, attending compulsory classes in the square, and sobbed out the news.

The parents told them what to do and then said goodbye to them, knowing that it might be goodbye forever. The children lashed together an arrangement of bamboo poles that could be carried as a litter and floated as a raft. They put the priest on this and carried him down the back lanes of the village. They hid him near the bank of the river, which formed one of the boundaries of the free zone. After dark, they lowered the raft gently to the water and, with three on each side, paddled to the middle of the river, where they were swept into the downriver current. The coolness of the water probably did more for the priest than most of my medicines. They managed to get him across the river to the free zone without being seen. Arriving late at night, they carried the man to the hut of his sister. Then they came to find me.

I made daily visits to him thereafter and gave him antibiotics and more morphine. Miraculously, he survived; his own strong constitution and, no doubt, his faith brought about a cure.

Sooner than I would have considered likely he was sufficiently recovered to be taken to Camp de la Pagode. Although he was still crippled, he was soon saying daily mass and teaching the children their catechism; in fact, for a time he served as the camp's more or less regular chaplain.

Perhaps I should have let him do it when he insisted that he must return to the village. Perhaps the world needs martyrs, although Tonkin, I thought, had an oversupply already. Next time the Communists would have killed him for sure.

I know that it is not just to judge a whole system from the conduct of a few. However, this was communism to me. This was the ghoulish thing which had conquered most of the Orient and with it nearly half of all mankind. From December until the last day, there were two or three atrocities a week that came within my orbit. My night calls took me to one horror after another.

Early in my Haiphong stay I was puzzled not only by the growing number but by the character of Communist atrocities. So many seemed to have religious significance. More and more, I was learning that these punishments were linked to man's belief in God.

Priests were by far the most common objects of Communist terror. It seemed that the priests never learned their "Hoc-Tap Dan-Chu," their "Democratic Studies and Exercises," as well as they were expected to. This means that they had to be reeducated more severely than others. It is difficult to take men whose life had been dedicated to belief in God and straighten them out so that they no longer believe in God. In fact, most of them proved unconquerable.

Catholics have many pious ejaculations which they utter frequently "Jesus, Mary, and Joseph," for example, and "Lord have mercy on us." The Communists ordered the priests to substitute new slogans for them, for example, "Tang gai san u xuat" (increased production), and "Chien tran nhan" (the people's war). Perhaps the expression most often heard in the conquered north was "Com Thu" (hatred).

The Communists have perfected the techniques of torture, inflicting in one moment pain on the body and in the next pain on the mind. When Tonkin spring came and the monsoon ended, I thought perhaps nature might bring a change in the tenor of things. I was wrong. On the first Sunday of March, I was asked by Father Lopez of the Philippine Catholic Mission to come visit a "sick man," a priest who had just escaped from the Vietnam.

We walked across the huge sprawling

courtyard to the living quarters. In a back room there was an old man lying on straw on the floor. His head was matted with pus and there were eight large pus-filled swellings around his temples and forehead.

Even before I asked what had happened, I knew the answer. This particular priest had also been punished for teaching "treason." His sentence was a Communist version of the crown of thorns, once forced on the Savior of whom he preached.

Eight nails had been driven into his head, three across the forehead, two in the back of the skull and three across the dome. The nails were large enough to embed themselves in the skull bone. When the unbelievable act was completed, the priest was left alone. He walked from his church to a neighboring hut, where a family jerked the nails from his head. Then he was brought to Haiphong for medical help. By the time of his arrival, 2 days later, secondary infection had set in.

I washed the scalp, dislodged the clots, and opened the pockets to let the pus escape. I gave the priest massive doses of penicillin and tetanus oxide and went back to the mission every day. The old man pulled through. One day when I went to treat him, he had disappeared. Father Lopez told me that he had gone back to that world of silence behind the Bamboo Curtain. This meant that he had gone back to his torturers. I wonder what they have done to him by now.

Priests were not the only victims of brutality. One day an old woman came to sick call in the camp. She was wearing a cloth bound tightly around her shoulders in a figure of 8. We removed the cloth and found that both the collar bones had been fractured. En route to the camp, she told us, she had been stopped by a Viet Minh guard who, for the crime of attempting to leave her land, had struck her across the shoulders with the butt of his rifle, ordering her to go back home. This fractured the bones, making her shoulders slump forward and causing excruciating pain. Nevertheless, she managed to escape. In time, with medical care and a regimen of vitamins, she healed.

Always there was the painful thought: "My God. For every one of these who come here, there must be hundreds or even thousands who could not escape."

One day a young man came to sick call with a marked discoloration of the thumbs. They were black from the first joint to the tips. He has suffering from gangrene, of the dry type, called mummification. There was no great pain, no blood, just raw necrosis of tissue.

He said he had been hung by his thumbs to reeducate him. This had happened about a week earlier, and since then his thumbs had been getting a little darker every day. Now they were beginning to smell.

During the course of the examination, while I was manipulating the left thumb, a piece of it actually broke off. There was no bleeding, no pain; there was just a chunk of his thumb that stayed in my hand. This dried piece of flesh, like that of a mummy, had crumbled away with the slightest pressure. The circulation had been cut off for so long—he said he had been left hanging for days—that permanent damage had been done, and all the cells and tissue had died distal to the point where his thumbs had been tied with cord.

"But remember, my friend," one of the elders said to me, "these people might never have left the north if the Communists had not done these cruel deeds against those who preached and practiced their religion."

I feel sure he was right. There were many Buddhists among the refugees, but when I thought of the attendance at daily Mass I had no doubt that 75 or 80 percent of them were Catholics. Of the 2 million Catholics in Vietnam, about 1,750,000 lived in the north. Then came the Communists and inevitable disillusionment with the promised reforms. Perhaps they could have borne up

under the oppressive taxes, the crop quotas, the forced labor, and the loss of freedom. But when the right to worship God was taken from them—often by the most brutal means—they knew it was time to go.

"What fools they are, these Vietnam," the elder said. "They coax the people to stay, tell them lies, and even try to stop them at the perimeter. Then they do the very things that will drive the people into exile. Perhaps it is the will of God."

To say that the Communists tried to stop the refugees at the perimeter was to put it mildly. Though under the Geneva agreement anyone had a right to leave the north who wanted to, the Communists began to violate the agreement on this point from the day it was signed.

As I have indicated earlier, they employed trickery, threats, violence, and even murder to stop the southward rush of their subjects. "It is my duty," said Premier Diem in Saigon on January 22, 1955, "to denounce before the free world and before Christendom the inhuman acts of repression and coercion taken by the Vietnam against the populations wanting to leave the Communist zone, acts which are flagrant violations of the Geneva agreement."

The Premier later estimated that a quarter of a million more would have left if there had been no harassments. My own belief is that this figure is not half large enough. The unbroken flow of the luckier, and of the wounded and mangled who made it to the American camps, was a clue to how many failed to make it. Besides, it is reasonable to assume that thousands who thirsted for freedom lacked the courage or the vitality to take the risks.

Many and various were the Communist devices to keep the people in the north. They made it illegal for more than one member of a family to travel on a bus or train in the affected area at the same time; or for more than two persons to go on foot together on the roads pointing to the evacuation zone. This made it difficult for would-be refugees, whose families were large and held by powerful bonds of unity, to break away.

Nevertheless, desperate parents often sent their children ahead, two today, two tomorrow, with instructions to get to the American camp. By the dozens and the hundreds I saw youngsters, alone, exhausted, and sorrowful, arrive and settle down on the fringes of my camp to wait for their elders. Many a time they waited in vain.

In many parts of the Tonkin the Communists ruled that special passports would be required—not to leave the country; that would have flouted Geneva too crudely—but to cross from one canton into another. Obtaining the passports involved steep fees and fantastic red tape. But only with such documents were the refugees permitted to travel as family groups.

Having at long last received its passport, a family might set out on foot on the long road to Haiphong. Fifteen or 16 days later, their food almost gone, sore and perhaps sick, they would reach a canton line. They would run into that old dodge of the expired passport.

The Communist guard would examine their hard-won document and laugh, "Comrades, this passport is good for only 14 days. Didn't you know that? Oh, you can't read? Well, anyhow, go back and get a new one."

As a leftover of the war, many roads were sown with mines and booby traps. The victorious Communists dug them up. But often they did not detonate them. Instead they tossed them with designed casualness into rice paddies, swamps, and bushes close to the perimeter of our evacuation area. If citizens trying to crawl to freedom at night were blown to bits, it only served them right.

Yet here are the terms of the agreement: "Any civilians residing in a district controlled by one party who wish to go and

live in the zone assigned to the other party shall be permitted 'and helped to do so' by the authorities in that district." Those quoted words, of course, are mine.

TRADE LEGISLATION

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, extensive hearings are being held by the Committee on Ways and Means on trade legislation. Some 350 witnesses have asked to testify.

The trade policy of this country is due for a thorough review. This includes an assessment of its 30-odd year history and a judgment on how it fits the present-day economic and competitive standing of this country in world trade.

Such a review together with recommendations of new directions is provided in a statement made before the committee by O. R. Strackbein who is chairman of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy.

His statement is one that I hope will be read by all Members who seek a comprehensive view of where we stand in world trade and in our own market as it faces a rising tide of imports. I have introduced legislation designed to meet the problem faced by more and more of our industries as imports penetrate our market more deeply year after year.

Under unanimous consent I submit Mr. Strackbein's statement for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

TRADE LEGISLATION HEARINGS

(Statement of O. R. Strackbein, chairman, the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy before the House Ways and Means Committee, June 12, 1968)

We have heard a great deal over the years about the consumer who presumably holds the short end of the benefit derived from tariff protection. Indeed he is said to be mulcted in the form of higher prices resulting from the payment of customs duties. The higher prices caused by the tariff are held to be little more than a shield for productive inefficiency and to represent a subsidy to greed, stagnation and unearned profits.

The tariff is unquestionably a tax on goods, generally indirect except when it is collected on imports made by individuals in which case it is direct. If taxes are an evil as such the tariff is necessarily then also an evil. If taxes, on the other hand, may produce beneficial results even though they add to the cost of living, the tariff may also confer benefits on those who pay it.

Again, if higher prices are an evil in and of themselves the tariff is necessarily also an evil to the extent at least as it raises prices. If, however, higher prices are sometimes justifiable, such as those might be held to be that are caused by the collection of social security taxes and those called for by other social legislation, or those that rescue farmers from ruin, the higher prices attributable to tariff protection may, again, also be justified.

It has always been a source of wonder to me when someone says that consumers benefit from the lower prices afforded by imported goods, that there is no evident inclination to make inquiry into the credentials of the low level of the prices. A special

blessing of some kind seems to reside in lower consumer prices, and especially so if they are associated with imported merchandise. Consumers in any case are generally delighted to buy distress merchandise if the bargain is sufficiently attractive. They seldom pause to ask about the cause of the distress and they do not usually care.

We are all bargain hunters and the penchant seems to be ineradicable. Actually there is nothing wrong with this lure but we do wrong to raise it to the level of an unmitigated virtue. Confidence men thrive on this human weakness. It is rather closely linked with greed; but it can be curbed by overriding considerations.

If a bargain price on goods is examined for its justification it will be found that it owes its offer to one or another of a variety of elements: (1) it may spring from distress suffered by the owner of the goods and represents an effort by him to recoup a part of a loss; (2) it may arise from a stroke of luck, thus exacting little cost from the possessor of the merchandise, and he makes a good profit even at a low price; (3) the offered goods may have been obtained through fraud or theft and have cost no more than the risk incurred in passing title to tainted merchandise; (4) the low offered price may reflect the seller's ignorance of the higher market value of the product; (5) it may represent a lure to prospective buyers with an eye to future sales to them at profitable prices; (6) it may represent a price level that is low because of special cost advantages enjoyed by the producers not universally enjoyed by others; (7) or the lower price may result from nothing more mysterious than low wages.

The latter two cases are the ones of principal interest here. The cost advantage may indeed be genuine, as an outgrowth of rich resources, such as may be encountered in mineral deposits, fertility of soil, abundance of flora or fauna in the natural state; an extraordinary blessing of climate, inventive genius, superior competence and vigor of management, or the like. It may then represent a true saving to the purchasers without robbing the seller of a fair profit or taking advantage of his distress.

On the other hand, the cost advantage may come to rest largely or solely on the base of low wages. It does not then represent higher efficiency or a productivity advantage.

Bargains may also be offered under duress, such as might be experienced under conditions of an over-supply of goods in relation to demand, financial stringency or bankruptcy. There may then exist a mutuality between buyer and seller. The latter may be saved from a worse fate if the buyer responds to the bargain. Nevertheless the situation leading to such bargains is not one that is to be sought by consumers as responsible members of the economic body. No system could long endure if duress, emergency and distress dictated the terms of trade throughout the economy.

The order of bargain that is most relevant to the question of free trade or protection are numbers (6) and (7) in the classification offered just now. The true economic bargain is genuine in the sense that the low price is derived from advantage of resource, skill and energy of workers, technology, superior management or the like. There is no element of duress or distress pressing upon the seller; nor is he practicing fraud or deceit. The bargain is not the result of sweated and underpaid labor. The low price reflects true cost advantages that are solidly and honestly based. This style of bargain alone should justify free trade.

Free trade unfortunately makes no distinction between the character of these advantages and disadvantages. It simply calls for global economic interchange of goods without tariffs or other trade barriers, no matter what the credentials of the bargains.

It has, oddly enough, a blind spot toward low wage levels.

Such is the message of free trade. It stands in an odd light today in view of its indifference to social implications. Yet it is precisely loyalty to this socially neutral principle that has unreflectingly counseled our Trade Agreements and Trade Expansion Programs. (Free trade was the favorite economic weapon of colonialism. The stirrings of UNCTAD are but an echo of this economic repression of former colonies.)

Meanwhile the economy at home was judged by very different standards. Social implications were at the very center of economic judgment; in fact, wrote the ticket. Low wages, sweat shop wages and child labor were severely condemned, and were made the subject of punitive legislation. They were regarded as influences undermining the consumer purchasing power that was necessary to absorb the output of our mass production; and this was a rational judgment.

It represented a logical linking of the two prime movers of our ever more consumer-oriented economy. The result was regulation of the national economy in a manner that was the exact opposite of the movement toward freeing of international trade. Whereas on the domestic front we pounced on every visible factor or influence that might reduce or stagnate labor income (by far the principal source of consumer purchasing power) we were bent under the witch-hunter's free-trade zeal of the time, to expose our economy outwardly to the very forces we sought to stamp out at home. Low wages abroad were evidently a blessing that allowed us as consumers to enjoy bargains from foreign sources that, had the bargains been compounded here by use of equally lowly-paid labor, would have subjected us to a fine if it had not indeed sent us to jail.

Strange economics indeed! How could two such opposite courses be justified? The answer is that they found their justification in emotional responses to the frustration of the Great Depression and economics had little to do with it. Governmental planning, including numerous five-year plans over the world, was much in vogue. We were scared and we were angry. That was enough.

The planned and controlled economy toward which we were moving was the very antithesis of free trade, but we could swallow the inconsistency without gulping.

Actually we had some scope for play. Our tariffs had been high, and, secondly, other countries were technologically far to the rear of us. Their lower wages did not pose nearly the threat that they would have, had foreign productivity been nearer our levels.

However, the course we pursued was one of ripping away the cushion while helping other countries to a more productive manufacturing technology. We reduced our defenses while improving their competitive weapons.

It is not surprising that in time the moment of truth should arrive. It is upon us today; but first, a little more review.

It is true, we did not adopt a five-year plan, but since the Great Depression we instituted many far-reaching interferences with the free play of economic forces and thus distorted natural competitive advantages and disadvantages, often beyond recognition. It is indeed not easy to think of a segment of the economy that has not come under regulation. To repeat, we have been deeply concerned, and quite rationally so, with the maintenance of consumer purchasing power of sufficient volume to keep our productive plant running at a level that would provide at least reasonably full employment. Witness the so-called Full Employment Act of 1946 and its frequent amendment to raise the minimum wage level. Yet our economists insist on looking upon our apparent competitive advantages and disadvantages as if they reflected the free market forces!

Having grasped the significance of consumer purchasing power and its power of life or death over the fortunes of mass production, the assurance of a high level of purchasing power, in the form of "effective demand", i.e., demand backed by cash, bank deposit or credit, became the lodestar of our economic legislation. Minimum wages, shorter hours (for fuller employment), unemployment compensation, obligatory collective bargaining, social security, farm price supports—all these and others, were measures in the conception of which the function of consumer purchasing power played a leading role. Considerations of a free market economy did not figure in the conceptual formulation. Any freedom that might be preserved was largely incidental.

We had learned the ghastly lesson in the early 1930's of a gigantic productive ensemble of plant structures, mills, mines, transportation lines, banks and farm lands, standing half paralyzed, mocking in their bleakness the feverish activity and fond hopes that had center on free private enterprise. Without adequate consumer purchasing power, the giant was like a huge beast with its blood ebbing from its veins, leaving it a hulk of weakness.

We administered transfusion in the form of pump-priming, straining to restore some of the lost vigor. While we cursed the system that brought us distress, we nevertheless did not forsake it outright, knowing that it had outstripped the rest of the world in providing material plenty. There were many hostile voices and some that would have overturned and discarded the system, but they did not prevail. After all, looking around, there was no other system that had done nearly as well. We set about modifying it according to the dictates of mass consumption as the absorbent of mass production. Control superseded the free market.

The crisis was passed, helped by the gathering war clouds at the end of the dark decade. World War II enhanced the leadership of our system and pulled us out of the depression. Other countries witnessed the astounding industrial power possessed by our economy as it provided the arsenal for a hard-won victory a second time in a generation. Friend and foe alike were impressed; but what would happen at demobilization time? Could we convert without acute withdrawal symptoms?

Contrary to widespread apprehension we made the transition from war to peace without the horrible crash anticipated by many. We boldly eliminated wage and price controls and after a while dropped the excess profits tax. Business was given a phenomenally free rein.

Much pent-up demand, both domestic and foreign, was of course released upon our business front. Wages went up, prices went up, profits went up. Then before our production caught up, the Korean outbreak added another fillip to prices, especially those for raw materials, minerals and farm products. When this subsided the cold war came forward as a replacement. The upward trend continued.

After ten years of the activity engendered by these developments this country was confronted with several elements of reality that were catching up with us: early glimpses of the moment of truth. We sat on the highest wage plateau in the world. In another ten years, even after the appearance of some moderation, average weekly earnings reached a level seven times as high as in 1933 (\$16.33 in that year; \$114.90 in 1967).

Consumer prices also moved on the upward path during this period, but on a less steep slope, reaching a level in 1967 nearly two and a half times as high as in 1935 (47.8 in 1935; 115.0 in March 1967, where 1957-59 equals 100). (Statistical Abstract of the U.S., 1967, Table 504.) Of course, the great rise in wages would obviously have produced yet greater

inflation if productivity of both industrial and farm labor had not increased sharply during this period, each the product of technological advancement. The index of farm output per man-hour of labor rose from 36 in 1940 to 157 in 1966. (Op. cit., Table 926.) Industrial productivity also rose, but less sharply.

The upshot is that as a result of these and other developments this country has become rich, powerful and vulnerable. Our economy had meantime become incurably and hopelessly consumer-oriented. Other countries copied our system and are in full cry.

A look back to 1929 will give us a perspective that has been too much neglected by those who would understand the present-day American economy and the sensitivity of its balance. In the year when the Great Depression broke its black blizzard on the scene, wages were 58.2% of national income. Profits were 12.1%. This division of income has undergone a drastic change. With some fluctuations in the intermediate period, employee compensation in 1950 stood at 63.7% or well above the 1929 level. By 1955 this share had risen to 67.8%, and then continued to climb, reaching an estimated 71.1% in 1963, and 71.0% in 1966. (Op. cit., Table 452.)

Had the percentage in 1966 been at the same level as in 1929 employee compensation would have been \$278 billion in place of \$433.3 billion, or \$155 billion less. The effect on consumer purchasing power would have been catastrophic by present-day standards.

It is worth noting that employee compensation as a part of total corporate income is higher than the share of employee compensation in the economy as a whole. We saw the latter to be 71.0% in 1966, whereas 78.4% of corporate income was given out in employee compensation in 1965 and probably about the same in 1966.

By contrast total corporate profit after taxes as a share of national income has been much lower in recent years than in 1929. In that year, as we have seen, the rate was 12.1%. In 1940 it was 8.8%. In 1950 the profit level regained a high point of 10.3%, but thereafter a decline set in. The high taxes precipitated by the Korean outbreak brought the profit share down to 8.1% in 1955. By 1960 the rate had declined to 6.4% but rose in 1965 to 7.9%, where it remained in 1966. (Op. cit., Tables 452 and 697.)

Since 1929, in other words, the share of national income going into corporate profits has shrunk while the share going into employee compensation has increased. This trend was in keeping with the mass-production, mass-consumption formula.

Enough has been said to demonstrate how steeply the American economy is poised on layers of consumer income. This income is high in relation to the rest of the world, just as our wages are high. The relation between our wages and our total consumer income is very direct, since employee compensation stands at a little over 70% of total national income. We are a country of high wages, high income and high taxes, the latter traceable to high public expenditures, national, state and local. We are vulnerable and we have opened an import loophole that threatens and challenges our position.

Our economy has become increasingly dependent on the production and consumption of nonessential goods, or more specifically, luxury and semiluxury goods. This fact has sharpened the economy's sensitivity to market outlook, uncertainty and fears. From a heavy ballast of staples, such as bread, potatoes, beans, meat, gingham, cast iron stoves and similar fare and accoutrements of the humble, that kept our economy near the subsistence level, we have moved into a balloon capable of soaring to great heights but subject to buffeting by changeable atmospheric forces.

The elasticity of demand for goods that

may be bought or not bought, or the purchase of which may be postponed or dropped to a lesser quantity, makes both for a potentially livelier and more fickle economy.

When upward of seventy million pay-check collectors daily or weekly exercise their sovereign consumer option in the medium of thousands of competitors for their favor in the form of an infinite variety of goods, the struggle for survival by the producers and purveyors of the merchandise reaches a bustle of intensity.

What keeps the intricate machine running? What keeps the goods circulating from mine, farm, factory, over rail and highway into the storage shelves, bins, tanks, freezers, tiers and showcases throughout the country? The magnet is the effective consumer demand. The national gullet calls; no less than the arms and shoulders, the back, the feet and the heads of consumers, expressing demand for goods; the eyes, the ears—all the senses awaken and express the needs, desires and whims of the populace; all imaginable forms of human expressions of individual traits clamor for gratification; and the farms, mines and factories respond.

The mutual interchange and dependence is obvious. The problem of balance assumes delicate but weighty proportions. Business is guided, which is to say, buoyed or dampened, by the state of confidence in the future. Because of the consumer's strategic position his inclination becomes the concern and worry of business. That is why business expends so much money seeking to control or influence the consumer's mood. Uncertainty of the future robs the business man of his dynamism and the motive to expand.

Among the disturbers of confidence one of the most disruptive is doubt about market demand. Will an adequate market be on hand to absorb additional output? This represents a perplexing question when future production plans are on the agenda. An equally prolific source of doubt is the price level if it is under pressure or likely to be under pressure.

Naturally the sources of doubt and misgivings are many. In a sensitive field such as nonessential consumer goods the misgivings may lay a heavy hand on what would otherwise be energetic advancement; and this area looms even larger in our economy.

Among the serious and justified doubts that dampen plans of expansion, import competition looms high. Many examples of imports capturing a rapidly rising share of the domestic market abound. A number of large industries have shifted from a net export to a net import position in the past ten or fifteen years. Among these are textiles, steel, automobiles, typewriters, sewing machines, petroleum, household electronic goods (radios, TV). In other industries imports have bitten very deeply into the market: fish products*, hardwood plywood, pottery, watches, bicycles, mink skins, floor and wall tile, footwear, etc.

Under the national policy of stripping away most of what tariff protection remains to our industries, poised on a plateau of high labor costs and under the virtual mandate of assuring full employment, they find themselves between the upper and nether millstone.

If imports threaten deeper and deeper market penetration the cry for greater production efficiency and reduced production costs soon breaks the sound barrier. Yet there is only one way by which costs can be reduced materially, and that is by displacing labor by mechanical means. Since in corporate manufacturing employee compensation represents some 80% of today's outlay,

*80% of our groundfish market (cod, haddock, ocean perch) was supplied by imports in 1967 compared with 32% in 1950.

It is clear that there is no other source of cost-reduction of any real significance.

It is not fully appreciated what greater efficiency means in terms of employment in the not-so-short run. How can industry uphold its share of the full employment burden if its attention is concentrated on displacing workers—if with one hand it is to hire more workers and with the other to abolish jobs? It has been estimated that a 10% cost reduction in the manufacture of steel, for example, would call for the displacement of some 200,000 steel workers. This would be the price of becoming competitive even though our output of steel per man-hour is still well ahead of that of our competitors. We are the most efficient but not the most competitive! In the case of coal we have hard facts to go by. Competitiveness with oil and natural gas, which pressed with the same stubborn persistence as low-cost imports, became a matter of life or death to the industry. It achieved competitiveness; but what was the price? The sacrifice of 340,000 out of 480,000 jobs or two of every three! It was accomplished in fifteen years. The results? The poverty program known as Appalachia!

We can now see that our free-trade policy, running in the opposite direction of our domestic economic policy, has finally overtaken the hard realities. The moment of truth is here! The widening import loophole confronts our industries with fateful options.

We have all but discarded the tariff but we have not met the problems to which the tariff was addressed. If anything we have aggravated the problem in several respects: (1) we have through heavy electoral and legislative majorities placed rising cost burdens on our industries and producers, all for reasons regarded on the home front by majority sentiment, as good; (2) we have elected to ignore the competitive effect of these many measures, including burdens imposed by national defense, on our competitive position at home and abroad; (3) we have helped immeasurably the technological advancement of our competitors abroad, again for reasons regarded as compelling, but having the effect of enhancing the productivity of the industries abroad that compete with us; (4) we have reduced drastically our tariff and are committed to yet further reduction, thus opening our industries to a form of wage competition that we have been at great pains to make illegal at home. The wage gap has not narrowed appreciably.

Hence the imperative of high efficiency, if we are to compete.

Meanwhile our consumers or those who presume to speak for them continue eager for bargains, such as imports provide; but no one holds up his hand in a gesture of eager willingness to work for bargain wages, low salaries or bargain profits. Should we indeed work for the wage levels paid abroad our purchasing power and our economy would collapse; but we have to compete with them.

It is about time that we had matured sufficiently to realize that if as voters we seek all the emoluments we look for from the government, the bill will surely be presented for payment. We are confronted with it now, but it is not recognized for what it is, namely, among other things, a cost burden on production and a heavy international competitive disadvantage.

Our trade balance has suffered reverses in recent times and no wonder. We have indeed deluded ourselves by means of governmental statistical devices into believing that we were enjoying a bountiful export surplus, whereas we have been suffering from competitive weakness concealed by the improbable statistics.

The bargains we crave are paid for by ourselves although we think we get them free or at the expense of someone we do not know. In recent years these bargains have taken the

form more and more of manufactured goods from abroad. These imports, incorporating the maximum amount of low-cost foreign labor, rose six times as rapidly from 1960-66 as our imports of raw materials, which incorporate the least amount of low-wage foreign labor and therefore offer a lesser bargain.

If we continue on our present course we will collide soon with a harder and yet sharper form of reality.

Whatever else needs to be done, a substitute for the discarded tariff must be found. Ceilings on imports, designed to offer a liberal share of our market to imports and permitting imports to grow as our market grows, offer the best instrument. Such value as imports and trade offer us would be preserved while imports would be prevented from running wild, destroying confidence in industry after industry, and driving more and more of our capital abroad, which should find a place here where it would help our economy more surely and more directly.

The fear that import quotas would lead to higher prices is not borne out by the industries that have operated under import quotas in recent years. Moreover, imports have risen appreciably in most instances even as import quotas were in effect.

We believe that enactment of the Fair International Trade Bill is not only justified but would confer great benefits on our economy. Enactment of HR 16936 would close the free-trade loophole, threatening as it does, to undo thirty-five years of legislation designed to keep the mass-production, mass-consumption equation in an upward-moving balance in this country.

It would give us a better perspective if some of the popular notions induced by public statements were tested by the facts. Much, for example, is made over the American selling price (ASP) on organic chemicals. Yet, from 1960-65 imports of organic chemicals climbed 164%, whereas exports of chemicals rose only 50%. The outcry against ASP is hardly justified by such a performance. Yet, one of the prime planks in the Administration trade proposal is abolition of the American selling price!

HOUSE SCHOLAR'S GALLERY

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of House Resolution 935, which would amend the rules of the House of Representatives so as to reserve a place in the House galleries for scholars engaged in the study of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, under the present situation, serious researchers have no special status. As you are aware, the present procedure is designed to handle large number of spectators who pause for a few minutes in the House galleries while touring the many points of interest on Capitol Hill. Most of these citizens have no desire to spend hours watching the House in session.

However, this procedure works to the decided disadvantage of scholars who do want to observe the House for long periods. At present, if the galleries are crowded, spectators must surrender their places every 10 or 15 minutes and stand in line for readmission to the galleries.

Now 15 minutes in the House galleries is usually sufficient time for visitors to

observe the House of Representatives, since, in most cases, they have other places to go that day. But for serious scholars, 15 hours may not be time enough for their observation of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we know that knowledge of our political processes is one of the foundations of our free society. We have recognized the importance of the Nation's press in this regard. By setting aside a portion of the galleries for the use of the news media, we have helped insure that our free institutions remain free by encouraging a flow of information to our citizens.

But the press is mainly concerned with offering moment-to-moment glimpses of what Congress is doing. But there are those in the academic field who want to study the Congress in depth, and through their writings offer a long overview of our activities.

I believe it is time that we reserve a portion of the galleries for those researchers who meet certain qualifications of scholarship.

The conditions of scholarship which I have outlined in this resolution I believe to be fair. In order to obtain access to the galleries a researcher would have to be currently engaged in a project that would include a study of the House of Representatives as an important part of the project. He would have to be either a full-time faculty member of an accredited institution of higher learning; pursuing independent postdoctoral research; or preparing a doctoral dissertation to be submitted to an accredited institution of higher learning.

Mr. Speaker, the qualifications called for by this resolution are restrictive in that they will not grant special use of the House galleries to students seeking a Bachelor's or a Master's degree. Use of this special academic section will be limited to those men and women who will be giving lectures, counseling students, and writing textbooks. I believe the seriousness of this task warrants an interrupted view of the Congress. They should not have to watch it operate at arbitrary intervals.

Mr. Speaker, I have received considerable favorable comments from scholars on House Resolution 935 and I submit the resolution and letters from several leading students of the House for inclusion at this point in the Record:

STANFORD UNIVERSITY,

Stanford, Calif., December 7, 1967.

HON. JAMES O'HARA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I am writing to express my enthusiastic support for H. Res. 935, to authorize the creation of a House Scholars' Gallery.

As I am sure you know, the difficulties that serious scholars encounter in trying to do research on Congress have been magnified by the increasing flood of tourists, students, interns, and other claimants for space in the galleries and the time and attention of people on the Hill. I have suffered a good deal from this problem myself, as have a number of other political scientists. It has gotten so bad that we find it difficult even to observe what goes on on the floor because of the restrictions on the amount of time one can spend in the public galleries and on note-taking in these galleries. For these reasons, it would be a great help to us and, I believe,

to the cause of scholarships on Congress, if we were able to have some place where we could watch the floor without restrictions about time or taking notes.

I hope that you will press H. Res. 935 to passage.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND E. WOLFINGER,
Associate Professor.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Berkeley, Calif., December 8, 1967.

Representative JAMES O'HARA,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE O'HARA: I would like to express my enthusiastic support for your plan to start a Scholars' Gallery in the House, embodied in your H. Res. 935 and Rep. Schwengel's H. Res. 578. I can think of nothing that would please me more, as a scholar, than this recognition of the effort that so many of us have made over the years to bring the true story of the House and a sophisticated understanding of how it operates home to our students and colleagues. We have been forced, all these years, to operate under a handicap; unlike our friends in the press gallery, we are forbidden to take notes and even, sometimes, to be present in the gallery when important events take place on the floor.

You and your colleagues can rely on us to make effective and responsible use of a gallery if it is granted to us. The best testimony you have to that is the work we have done already to bring the House closer to the people. In future years we would like to do more and do it better. Your resolution gives us one of the amenities we badly need to further the disinterested, scholarly study of Congress. I believe it is a sound investment that will pay dividends in the minds and hearts of future generations of Americans.

With warm personal regards,

NELSON W. POLSBY,
Professor.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER,
Rochester, N.Y., December 11, 1967.

Representative JAMES O'HARA,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE O'HARA: I'm writing to record my strong support for H. Res. 935. I can think of no more beneficial step which Congress, for its part, could take to aid those of us who are devoted to accurate description of the Congress than to create a House Scholars Gallery. As you well know, rapport between members of Congress and professional students of Congress has improved markedly in recent years—with the result that public (and especially student) understanding of the Congress has reached a new level of sympathetic sophistication. I applaud the efforts of Rep. Schwengel and yourself to build solidly on that foundation of mutual understanding.

Sincerely,

RICHARD FENNO,
Department of Political Science.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY,
Columbus, Ohio, January 19, 1968.

HON. JAMES O'HARA,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I am heartily in accord with both the general purposes and the specific provisions of H. Res. 935, which would create a twelve-seat gallery for scholars studying the House of Representatives.

I have spent most of the last five years studying the House, particularly the activities of the party leaders in it. It was extremely frustrating, when observing an important floor debate, to be rotated out of the gallery with the tourists and miss much of

the activity while waiting in line for another seat. Your proposal would prevent such frustrations and would guarantee a continuity of observation that, in the long run, should help allow political scientists and other scholars to write more knowingly and intelligently about the House.

You have my best wishes and full support as you endeavor to amend Rule XXXIV by your resolution.

Sincerely,

RANDALL B. RIPLEY,
Associate Professor.

H. RES. 935

Whereas freely elected legislatures are vitally important in maintaining the values, the institutions, and the processes of our democratic society;

Whereas scholars in the past decade have become increasingly interested in the organization, the operation, and the functions of the Congress of the United States;

Whereas publication of scholarly research contributes substantially to teaching and to public understanding of and appreciation for the role of the Congress in the American system: Therefore be it

Resolved, That rule XXXIV of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"4. (a) Such portion of the gallery of the House of Representatives as may be necessary to accommodate up to twelve scholars shall be set aside for their use, and such scholars shall be admitted thereto under such regulations as the Speaker may from time to time prescribe.

"(b) The supervision of the portion of the gallery of the House of Representatives set aside under this clause for scholars shall be vested in a standing committee of scholars which shall be selected by the Speaker, in consultation with the American Political Science Association, and which shall be subject to his direction and control.

"(c) For purposes of this clause, the term 'scholar' means a scholar who is actively engaged in a research project that includes a study of the House of Representatives as an integral and substantial part of the project, and who is (1) a full-time faculty member of an accredited institution of higher learning, (2) pursuing independent postdoctoral research, or (3) preparing a doctoral dissertation to be submitted to an accredited institution of higher learning."

THE CHALLENGE TO CONGRESS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the need for controls of the sale and possession of firearms is all too clear. Without endangering the legitimate rights of any American we can and we must stop the proliferation of weapons that makes it so easy for irresponsible, irrational individuals to possess guns.

Now the Congress is being asked by millions of Americans to act, even while a forceful lobby attempts to convince us of the wisdom of an unsound objection to gun control legislation. A recent editorial in the Long Island Press set forth the problem and urged that the Congress act with wisdom and dispatch. Because this editorial, as its title indicates, is a "Challenge to the Congress," I include this editorial in the RECORD, as follows:

The National Rifle Association is counter-attacking.

In the face of unprecedented public pressure for gun controls, the powerful NRA is rallying its 900,000 members to fire back with a withering barrage of letters to Congressmen.

Harold W. Glassen, NRA president, laid down the line the letters should take: "The right of sportsmen in the United States to obtain, own and use firearms for proper lawful purposes is in the greatest jeopardy in the history of our country," he said in a two-page letter to the members. They oppose all three major gun bills before the Congress.

One bill would ban mail-order sale of rifles and shotguns; another would require registration of all firearms. The third would require licensing of all gun-owners with licenses forbidden to former convicts, drug addicts and persons convicted of felonies. The bill now before the President applies only to handguns—pistols and revolvers.

The NRA, in exhorting its members to write to their Congressmen, warned that the objective of gun laws is to end all civilian ownership of firearms. Yet no such measure is even suggested by any responsible proponent of controls—including police, religious and other leaders representing a wide spectrum of public and private life in America.

If the rights of sportsmen, hobbyists, hunters and all other law-abiding citizens to own guns were in any way jeopardized, there would be full justification for the NRA alarm. But there is nothing in any of the legislation before Congress—and there should be nothing—that would bring into conflict the legitimate rights of sportsmen and hobbyists to their guns and the legitimate rights of the public to a measure of protection, where none now exists, against gun ownership by the criminal and the incompetent.

The conflict we do have is the confrontation between the public and a narrow group demanding special treatment the public feels is against its interest. The NRA, supported by funds from gun dealers and manufacturers who advertise heavily in its national magazine, and by dues from its membership, raised \$5.7 million last year. Most of this money was used to lobby against gun controls, although the NRA is classified as a "social welfare organization" and thus enjoys tax exempt status.

In stepping up its opposition to any meaningful gun controls in the face of the insistent public clamor, the gun lobby has escalated the war of words beyond the issue of control. Yet two things are clear. There is first the responsibility of Congress to enact weapons control, not as a cure-all for violence, but as one step to help curb this curse. And secondly, it is now a test of Congressional responsiveness to the people. Everyone is watching how Congress chooses between the loud and clear demands of the general public and the loud and clear demands of a well-heeled special segment of that public.

THE VIOLENT STATES OF AMERICA: A NATION IN SURGERY

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1968

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, following the tragic assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy, Los Angeles Times sports columnist Jim Murray expressed feelings which I believe reflect those of many Americans. My constituent, Mr. Van C. Newkirk, brought this column to my attention and asked that it be shared with the Members of this House.

Mr. Murray's column follows:

THE VIOLENT STATES OF AMERICA: A NATION IN SURGERY

(By Jim Murray)

LAKE TAHOE.—I was going to write to you about fun and games today—a golf match on a sylvan lake, a track meet in a municipal amphitheater.

But once again America the Beautiful has taken a bullet to the groin. The country is in surgery. The Violent States of America. One bullet is mightier than one million votes.

It's not a Democracy, it's a Lunacy. A country that shrinks from punishing its criminals, disciplining its children, locking up its mad. It's like an animal that disregards its senses. It's a lamb defending the lion's right to eat it.

Democracy is in the cross-hairs. The Assassination Party wins elections without going in a primary. The President of the United States is chosen in a hardware store, a mail order catalogue. We blame Dallas, but it's no good. It happens everywhere. Memphis. Los Angeles. The United States.

We quarantine the good, the reliable, the honest. We keep 24-hour watch on the trustworthy, but get a habeas corpus to let anarchy loose.

Freedom is being gunned down. The "right" to murder is the ultimate right in this country. Sloth is a virtue. Patriotism is a sin. Conservation is an anachronism. God is over 30 years old. To be young is the only religion—as if it were a hard-won virtue. "Decency" is dirty feet, a scorn for work. "Love" is something you need penicillin for. "Love" is handing a flower to a naked young man with vermin in his hair while your mother sits home with a broken heart. You "love" strangers, not parents.

I will be severely criticized, even ridiculed for crying out. "Lousy sportswriter, what does he know?" I can hear it said. "Who does he think he is, Paul Harvey?" "Fulton J. Murray," still others will sneer. This is the 20th Century, they will say, not Disneyland. Well, it's getting to look more like the Cave Man Era every day from this seat. Americans who have a podium should use it today.

I like people with curtains on the window, not people with "pad." The next guy that calls money "bread" should be paid off in whole wheat. I'm sick of being told I should try to "understand" evil. Should a canary "understand" a cat?

These are some of the things, it seems to me, that has put blood on the walls of America. The next funeral procession will be for the Republic itself. The American Dream will be rolling up Pennsylvania Ave. behind the roll of drums. It will be buried in Arlington. The Constitution was never conceived as a shield for degeneracy. You start out burning the flag and you end up burning Detroit. You do away with the death penalty for everyone but presidential candidates—and Presidents. The national symbol is not the eagle, it's the catafalque.

The point of the country is Fear. The rebellion is against good. Men of God become men of the Mob. The National Anthem is a scream in the night. Americans can't walk in their own parks, get on their own buses. They have to cage themselves.

"Get off your knees, America!" people cry, but it is ignored. Bare your teeth, they say. Threaten to fight back. The lion bares his teeth and the jackals slink away. A cowering animal invites attack. But America is not listening.

These are the things, it seems to me, that put a young senator, a servant of his people into the shadow of death. A young, vigorous country is immobilized by bumper stickers, slogans, neurotic students with their feet on desks they couldn't make, pulling down universities they wouldn't know how to rebuild.

It all begins with that, the defecation of

drifters, wastrels, poltroons—insolent guests at the gracious table of democracy overturning it on their dismayed hosts.

What have the Kennedys ever done to deserve ambushes every five years at the hands of people they ask only to serve? What apology can we offer to a noble family except to resolve to stop being ruled by our refuse, our human refuse that is? How many good men have to die before we wrest weapons from the terrible hands of our barbarians, demand respect for our institutions, stop glorifying hate?

Pray God our healers can repair Bobby Kennedy. Who is going to repair America?

DAVID M. NICHOLS WINS SOROPTIMIST FOUNDATION INTERNATIONAL CITIZENSHIP AWARD

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, we in Kansas are all proud and pleased at the accomplishment of Dave Nichols who has won the Soroptimist Foundation International Award. Dave is the son of Reverend and Mrs. C. William Nichols of Kansas City, Kans., and a graduate of Wyandotte High School. This award has even greater significance in view of the national and international turmoil. The need for development of high concepts of patriotism in the youth of America has never been greater. I would like to bring Dave's winning entry to the attention of my colleagues.

DAVID M. NICHOLS' WINNING ENTRY APPLICATION

1. What do you consider your citizenship responsibility in the family?

A family, as a social unit, requires of its members the same qualities of good citizenship that must be in evidence in any healthy community. Of primary importance among these are respect, responsibility, and contribution. I feel a keen sense of responsibility for the happiness and welfare of my family, for it is my family, every bit as much as it is my father's family or my mother's. The sum total of my family's happiness depends greatly upon my attitude, my disposition, and my willingness to share in the home responsibilities. Like an automobile engine missing in one cylinder, the whole family is robbed when one of its members does not fulfill his obligations. I believe, too, that I must feel and give respect to each of my family members. As I want the freedom to be an individual, so am I willing to give that same right to them. I accept them as they are and respect their right to voice all opinions, ideas, and decisions. I must add that I do not always agree with them, but that is what is so great about a family. As intimate a group as has ever been, my family acts as a sounding board for all my ideas and I know that all I have said is held in the strictest confidence. Again, I owe the same courtesy to each family member. I owe my family whatever contribution I may make with my own traits and abilities. I have received much from my parents and I believe that I must give as I have received. The greatest gift my family has given me is the gift of love. They have not only loved me, but they have taught me how to love. So I, in turn, shall give my love to others through no feeling of responsibility, but rather feeling that it is a happy opportunity to find concrete and definite ways of expressing my love for my family. I want my

family—as well as my school, my church, and my country—to have cause to remember that I put in more than I took out.

2. State your views of your citizenship responsibilities in the community.

I feel a deep sense of gratitude toward my community, for it has given me a splendid education and has manifested a continuing interest and concern for all the areas of my development. In recognition of this debt, I feel these responsibilities: First, I believe I owe it to my city to be, myself, a law-abiding citizen, and to encourage other youth, by my actions and attitudes, to act responsibly toward civil authorities and with respect toward other citizens and their rights and possessions. I know that many cities are now experiencing grave troubles attributed to the rebellious and disrespectful acts of some young people. As an individual and as a possible leader of other individuals, I want my life to reflect honor to my city. I know that in every city there is bad and good. Though I may lack the power or the influence to eradicate the bad, I believe I may make a positive contribution by adding the strength of my participation to everything that is good. I believe that, as a good citizen, I must support my church and those other humanitarian institutions which seek to help people and to uphold the principles of integrity. Furthermore, I believe the education invested by my community in me is a trust. I owe it to my city to allow my education to fulfill the hopes of those who provided it for me. I shall not consider that I have discharged my debt to my community until I have, through my vocation or profession, and through my participation in civic and religious affairs, helped to solve its problems and improve its wealth. But, in the meantime, I shall wear my city's name with honor, knowing that wherever I go, people will be judging my home town by me.

3. How do you view your role as a citizen of the World?

I recognize that this age into which I have been born is an age of gigantic troubles and dangers. But I also believe that the gravity of the problems only increases the urgency of the responsibility which every citizen must accept. I refuse to concede to despair, and I refuse to surrender to the cowardly escape of apathy. I believe genuine concern must lead to participation. And if I repudiate any evil in the world, I do not believe that I will have discharged my responsibility by condemning it or protesting it. I believe the only effective protests are waged by those who give their lives developing alternatives to the unacceptable. I refuse to believe that, just because I am one person in a family of three and one-half billion people, I can do nothing to help. First, I can always make sure that I am a part of the solution, and not a part of the problem. Next, it is my intentions to work, on whatever levels open to me, toward the passage of such legislation as will help solve the problems faced by the people of the world. Also, I intend to become involved! I am concerned about the needs of the people, and I will not acquiesce to troubles and ills of the world, just because they are not happening to me! If they are happening to anyone, they are of concern to me. I cherish my right to be my own man. But I consider it an honor to give myself to the world.

HOPE FOR THE FUTURE

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, we all receive hundreds of letters each day on

many and varied subjects. Once in a while, however, a letter comes in which stands apart. I recently received such a communication. It has been signed by a Negro religious prayer group and expresses a thought that gives hope to the future.

Nothing I could say would add to the deep, sound contents of this communication. In its simplicity there is sincerity. In its expressions, there is knowledge. In its appeal there is logic. I am bringing the letter to your attention for the value each of you might wish to place on it.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.,
June 12, 1968.

Congressman F. EDWARD HEBERT,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I was selected from our little Religious Group to write you some facts about the income exemption laws of \$600.00 per person for a year . . . how can a person live on such a small amount of money? We are asking for at least \$1200.00 a year for a dependent and the Government will not have to throw away so much money on poverty programs by having to pay a large salary to the higher up to issue the money to the jobless . . . by the time it gets to the needy all the money is gone and the jobless don't have nothing to live on. But if he has a job and knows that he can have \$1200.00 for each one of his dependents, he will be happy and will work harder because he can get the necessities of life and a little of the luxuries of life. Everything has gone up . . . one dollar in 1968 is worth only twenty-five cents.

The President said in a speech that he is sending out people to study violence. That is some more of our tax money being thrown away. No one in God's Green Earth can study that. Just ask the head of each family household to reason with their own families and conscience . . . how to have love in their own heart for their fellowman . . . to live and let others live . . . to help those who can't help themselves by providing proper public education and jobs and by all means, put Christ back in the public schools and colleges by having the Lord's Prayer said every morning and by blessing the food at noonday, then thanking Christ when the day is done for their lives.

Now if the Ways and Means Committee can find a little love in their hearts and reason with their own conscience to give us just about one-eighth of what it takes them to live and be happy . . . let us have a little bit of happiness . . . this world will be much better to live in.

Thanking you in advance to see that this message gets to the right hands in the White House.

In God We Trust,
Mr. and Mrs. FRANK ADAMS,
Rev. and Mrs. ISAAH TOUSSANT,
Rev. and Mrs. JACKSON PHILLIPS,
Mrs. HARRIET J. MARYLAND,
Mrs. GERTRUDE H. MATTHEWS,
Mrs. ALPHEODILE HILLS,
Mrs. MAGUERITE BLAZIO,
Mrs. IDA AYERS,
(Religious Prayer Group of Faith, Hope,
and Love).

PFC. BLANE M. RUBY, ON PATROL
IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Blane M. Ruby, a fine young man

from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

PFC. BLANE M. RUBY, ON PATROL IN VIETNAM

A young Baltimore marine who had been in Vietnam a little more than a month has been killed in action, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

He is Pfc. Blane M. Ruby, 19, son of Mr. and Mrs. Stanley L. Ruby, of 1514 Gleneagle road.

The Defense Department said Private Ruby was killed June 5 by gunshot wounds in the head received while on patrol in Quang Tri province.

His mother said yesterday that Private Ruby entered the Marines October 14, 1967, and went to Vietnam April 27. An infantryman, he was a member of Company C, 1st Battalion, 1st Marine Regiment.

BORN IN CUMBERLAND

Born in Cumberland, Private Ruby moved to Baltimore in 1958. He attended Woodbourne Junior High School and graduated from Mergenthaler Vocational-Technical Senior High School in 1966.

After graduation, he worked for Raymore Builders, Inc., and Schmidt Fords Sales, Inc., as a truck driver and mechanic, before enlisting in the Marines.

Besides his parents, he is survived by three brothers, David S. Ruby, of Baltimore, Air Force Sgt. Francis L. Ruby stationed at Biloxi, Miss., and Seaman Gary W. Ruby, stationed aboard the U.S.S. Puget Sound.

Sgt. Francis Ruby returned in October after serving one year in Vietnam.

LIKE IT IS, BABY—IX

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the following article, which appeared in a Minneapolis Star series entitled, "Poverty in Minneapolis: Like It Is, Baby":

THE TEENS: WANTING A FUTURE NOW

Marie Smith, 11, will be a teen-ager in two years, although to look at her you would say she already is.

She "matured fast," explained her mother in one of our talks about what it's like to be poor in Minneapolis.

Marie dresses in teen-age styles hemmed up to fit her because she's too large to wear children's sizes. She requires a brassiere.

Mrs. Smith is trying to keep Marie away from drinking and smoking and hopes she will grow up to be a "nice girl."

Sex has not yet become a major problem for Marie, and her mother says she will wait a while before she worries about that.

Mrs. Smith hopes to help Marie avoid the problems she herself has had—pregnant at 14, married and divorced before she was 16 and on Aid to Families with Dependent Children by the time she was 20.

In her neighborhood, marked by high juvenile delinquency and illegitimacy rates, however, she may have greater problems than if she lived in a comfortable middle-class suburb.

Even in her own family, Mrs. Smith can find examples of the problems teen-agers face.

Her aunt Esther, for example, has eight children, six of them teen-agers.

"All of them have been sent up," said Mrs. Smith.

The six, she said, have all been to the Hennepin County Home School at Glen Lake,

Minnetonka, and to the State Training School for Boys at Red Wing.

Their ages range from 13 to 19, and they have been imprisoned for "mostly everything except robbing," said Mrs. Smith, including stealing, and not going to school.

GO OUT AND TAKE IT

"They just want to have their own way," said Mrs. Smith. "If you don't give them what they want, they going to go out and take it."

Their mother is, of course, upset about the situation.

"She's called the police on them, told them to take them back." But the youths continue to be problems.

The aunt "can't do nothing about it," said Mrs. Smith. "She let them get out of hand, she say she's doing the best she can."

Some of the youths have been involved in antipoverty and school programs designed partly to discourage delinquency. But they don't stay with the programs longer than they want to.

"They don't want to keep it up," said Mrs. Smith.

Mrs. Smith said she has little contact with the police. Someone called them to the area once, and they came to her house by mistake, she said.

"I don't have no trouble with them," she said, "They're not sassy."

She had no trouble with police or neighbors during last summer's violence along Plymouth Av., she said.

She was "kinda scared," she said. She packed up her children and took them to her sister's house, a few blocks further south of Plymouth.

"Nothing came down here," she said, and she added that she was not very worried about the violence "just so they don't kill someone."

"They never did bother us this side of Plymouth," she said, "because most of us over here are colored people."

The violence itself had little effect on Mrs. Smith. The long-range effects may be more serious, although they may not be so obvious. They include lowering of property values, and the loss of businesses along Plymouth.

"We ain't got nowhere for groceries," said Mrs. Smith. She noted that a Goodwill store which had been on Plymouth closed after the riots. A food store, burned out when a Molotov cocktail was tossed through its window, has not reopened.

SHOOT, SHOOT, SHOOT

Mrs. Smith said she wished there were a store near her along Plymouth where she could buy groceries and one where she could buy clothes.

Such problems, and others, make Mrs. Smith want to leave the neighborhood.

"The kids fight too much," she said, and she has neighbors who "shoot, shoot, shoot" guns all night. "I just sit and shake," she said.

CHALLENGE FOR A BETTER
ENVIRONMENT

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, Assistant Secretary of the Interior Max N. Edwards recently gave a thoughtful and thought-provoking speech on the nature of the environmental crisis confronting us today. In the course of that speech, he suggested that there is a serious need to develop more adequate communication between the executive and legislative branches of the Government on these

issues. To open up this communication, Secretary Edwards proposes a periodic and comprehensive review of and report on resource policies by the executive branch of Government, followed by congressional review of that report, supported by informed public discussion and analysis of the executive report.

This is an interesting and imaginative idea, and I feel that it merits careful consideration. To facilitate that consideration, I include Mr. Edwards' speech in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY MAX N. EDWARDS, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL, BEFORE THE FONTANA CONSERVATION ROUNDUP, FONTANA DAM, NORTH CAROLINA, MAY 17, 1968

A great number of articles are being written these days and a lot is being said about the gradual erosion of the kind of environment man must have to sustain life on this planet. Many ecologists paint a very gloomy picture of life in the next century. Some tell us that continued destruction of our forests, plant life and estuaries, coupled with the earth's increased emission of carbon dioxide and sulfur oxide, will reduce the oxygen in the atmosphere to catastrophic, low levels.

Some prophets of darkness warn us of another ice age slowly eroding the Great Plains or polar ice caps melting and submerging every coastal city in the world lying less than 300 feet above sea level.

Yet another school insists that in our quest for a greater gross national product we can be assured of irrevocably destroying our sensitive ecological balance by excessively nourishing our creature comforts.

One simple truth of the matter is that Americans have forever been victims of the promoter who has always insisted that "bigger and more" is always best—or at least good enough. Some of us know better but we still cling to the short term profit philosophy of our forebearers. The real estate promoter is forever urging taller buildings and greater subdivisions with little thought to the total environment he molds or destroys. The automobile dealer has been so successful in his trade that we are assured that 40 percent more automobiles will be on our highways and in our parking lots in just 12 years. The roadbuilder's concern is pavement to the horizon for the use and enjoyment of just this generation. To say that he is oblivious to the destruction of park lands and forests, trout streams, and swimming holes, historic places and monuments would be uncharitable. He knows the consequences of these concrete bastions, but to the highwayman it is the Manifest Destiny of the Twentieth Century. And when his monotonous free-ways from coast to coast are complete and firmly fixed John Steinbeck reminds us in his delightful book, *Travels with Charlie*, that it will be possible to travel all the way from New York City to Los Angeles and see absolutely nothing.

Too often our political authorities at all levels of Government are goaded into decisions affecting our vital natural resources by financial pressures of more jobs, more taxes, and more industrial expansion. The catchy slogan "We want payrolls—Not picnics" for several years effectively beat back support to add a unique and scenic midwestern lake-shore area to our national park system.

Opposition to many construction projects in the past has been tantamount to resisting progress. The question of course is what constitutes progress. Is the dam or highway which wipes out the ecology of an entire area justified because it is more expedient and less costly? I submit that to preserve the integrity of our air, water and land resources we may expect in the future to pay more for less expedient highways, automo-

biles, electric power, agricultural crops, housing and real estate.

Pay more for less? This seems an anathema to our national system. But on fuller analysis, paying more means buying more—a better living space and a climate for economic and social well-being. The problem has come from our inability to see the social and long-term costs of "more" without "better." Or if we see the costs we cannot give them a dollar figure, so conclude they are worthless.

Paying more for automobiles will be worth it if they have effective emission control devices. Paying more for electricity will be buying more if we buy thermal pollution control of our waters.

Discounting all of the offensive billboards, neon signs and auto junk yards, the toxic wastess we pour into the atmosphere and into our lakes and streams should give sufficient alarm to the present course until we know more about where we are going.

A number of respected scientists predict that our end will not be in nuclear holocaust or by colliding with another planet, but by suffocating in our own waste and poison, by the gradual destruction of our ecology. Even the late Robert Frost had a philosophic quandary which might be worth repeating here. He says it with mixed emotions.

"FIRE AND ICE

"Some say the world will end in fire.
Some say in ice.

From what I've tasted of desire
I hold with those who favor fire.
But if it had to perish twice,
I think I know enough of hate
To say that for destruction ice
Is also great
And would suffice."

Other equally respected men of science scoff at these pessimistic predictions and ridicule their colleagues as peddlers of avant-garde scientific fiction. Whether these morbid prognostications are scientifically sound is open to debate. Yet, that being the case, it would be appropriate, indeed mandatory, that we proceed with caution and some degree of certainty in our efforts to reduce nature to the will of man. For today's comfort and convenience may be tomorrow's agony and bewilderment; this generation's profit may cost another's bankruptcy.

The classic example of economic and social myopia in America is witnessed in the great cities who throughout our history have used conveniently located streams and lakes as open sewers for filth, refuse, and waste of every kind.

Public tolerance for this practice grew from a false notion that the supply of water was endless and that people and their factories had a right to a quick and convenient disposal route. As apparent and offensive as this practice was even in the beginning, no one questioned the modus operandi of the early manufacturers and towns. Water was available in abundance, making quality no problem. But this is no longer true. The water per person has decreased with population growth and wastes have increased. Space between towns and factories has disappeared. Everyone now lives in someone else's backyard. One man's junkyard is another's living space. Our old and bad environmental habits and attitudes in this context must change if we are to have a livable world.

A part of that "myth of superabundance" which Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall refers to in his book, *The Quiet Crisis*, has left every river basin in the contiguous United States polluted. The question of utmost importance is whether industry, government and all levels of society together have the capacity and determination to reverse the trend toward greater water pollution in an economy so vitally dependent upon readily available supplies of clean water.

Now we treat our oceans in the same reckless manner as we did our inland lakes, streams, and estuaries in the 1800's and early 1900's. To most, the sea, if not bottomless, is limitless in its capacity to absorb the wastes of our society. The Henry Thoreaus of today see their warnings go unheeded. Most coastal cities barge their wastes to sea—usually just far enough out to "get by."

Some municipal and industrial planners have grand schemes to use the oceans as endless waste disposal without knowing the effect this practice might have on a marine ecology so beneficial, indeed essential, to mankind. An affluent world ironically faced with hunger cannot afford to gamble with the resources of the sea. Our lives or our children's may be at stake.

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS

Will we correct our environmental bad habits before it is too late? A current testing ground to gauge our will and measure our determination lies in implementing the Water Quality Act of 1965. This landmark legislation provides for the establishment of water quality standards, initiated by the states and submitted for approval to the Secretary of the Interior. The standards, which are applicable to interstate waters, are adopted by the states only after public hearings and approved by the Secretary when in his judgment the standards meet the requirements of the Act.

It should be clearly understood that the water quality standards called for by the 1965 Act consist of two basic ingredients: (1) Water quality criteria which establishes the use, and (2) A plan to enforce and implement them. The criteria relates to the numerical value assigned to such factors as biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), dissolved oxygen (DO), the temperature parameters, the acidity (Ph factor) and other conditions by which we measure water to determine what proper use it may be given. The plan for implementation and enforcement refers to when and how the criteria shall be applicable to specific areas.

These standards must take into consideration water use and value for public water supplies, propagation of fish and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses. In the same instance Section 10(c)(3) specifically provides that the water quality standards shall "... enhance the quality of water."

Interpreting the language of the statute set off a controversy among all water users which was resolved on February 8, 1968, by Secretary Udall's "nondegradation" statement. It was so named because (following approval of some of the initial standards in 1967) some of the mindful conservationists in this very audience vigorously protested that the Department was approving standards which permitted a lowering or degradation of existing water quality. Our critics were quick to remind us that we were ignoring the Congressional mandate to "enhance the quality of water."

Secretary Udall gave all sides their day in court and then decided to ask each state to include substantially the following language in their water quality standards:

"Waters whose existing quality is better than the established standards as of the date on which such standards become effective will be maintained at their existing high quality. These and other waters of your State will not be lowered in quality unless and until it has been affirmatively demonstrated to the State water pollution control agency and the Department of the Interior that such change is justifiable as a result of necessary economic or social development and will not interfere with or become injurious to any assigned uses made of, or presently possible, in such waters. This will require that any industrial, public or private project or development which would constitute

a new source of pollution or an increased source of pollution to high quality waters will be required, as part of the initial project design, to provide the highest and best degree of waste treatment available under existing technology, and, since these are also Federal standards, these waste treatment requirements will be developed cooperatively."

I should like to emphasize that we request from the states a statement only substantially similar to this. Like the standards themselves such language will necessarily vary from state to state. When it can be shown that necessary economic or social development justifies a reduction of water quality and that such reduction will not interfere with existing uses, a lowering of water quality will be permitted (if the new industry is willing to install the best practicable means of treatment to minimize its abuse of such high quality water).

Most segments of society have accepted the standards approach as a logical battle plan to attack one of the most critical domestic problems facing this country. Almost every state is to be congratulated for a genuine spirit of cooperation and a keen sense of purpose to accomplish the task at hand. Industry, too, should be lauded for seeking to upgrade its treatment technology to meet water quality standards. And for the most part business is moving forward willingly. As an example of a healthy attitude toward clean water, I am told that capital spending for the control of both air and water pollution by the business community will show a marked increase in 1968. Estimates given me show the chemical industry spending 42% more for water pollution control this year than in 1967. For the same purpose textiles will increase its funding 136%, the mining industry 51%, electric and gas utilities 32% and fabricated metals and instrument makers will be up 64%.

In administering the Water Quality Act we are of course not without our critics. Some have accused the Department of usurping the states' authority and others complain that we have formulated national water quality standards.

This is not true. We have been continually aware that the primary responsibility for establishing these standards rests with the states. Our policies, consistent with both the language and the spirit of the Congressional mandate, are designed to protect this principal responsibility. I want to make it perfectly clear that the standards are not identical. The wide variety of differences in the standards is reflected in the many designated uses of water, the nature of the water resource, climate, population, industrial activity and a host of other variables. No national standard is intended and when the states adopt standards of their own which meet the terms of the Act they are approved.

A few of our critics have complained that the Department has demanded the adoption of effluent standards relating to the quality of matter permitted to be discharged into interstate streams. More particularly, these few say that we are insisting upon secondary treatment or its equivalent. The main thrust of this argument is that we made this a requirement in a document, *Guidelines for Establishing Water Quality Standards for Interstate Waters*, dated May 1966. These Guidelines were not issued as Federal regulations but merely to give some direction to the states in adopting standards which would meet the requirements of the Act. Certainly the Guidelines could not be construed as a mandatory directive. Secondary treatment is an engineering term generally understood to refer to the removal of 75% to 90% of biological oxygen demanding materials. Sophisticated engineers know that the term is not directly transferable to most industrial plants effluents, that it is imprecise when it is used beyond its normal purview. That purview is the measure of treat-

ment of municipal wastes. Only when it is a fully accurate term should it be used, and when we can be more precise, other descriptions of quality should be used.

This Department has not demanded application of "secondary treatment" to all effluents as a pre-condition of approval of any State's standards. It is interesting to note, however, that almost every State has gone to what engineers shorthand jargon terms "secondary treatment" for its municipal wastes by its own choice.

In the Department we are not concerned with effluent standards but with standards of water quality and assuring that the set criteria to permit assigned uses will, in fact, be achieved within a reasonable period of time. That is our interest and I think we should stop this argument over what "secondary treatment" means and get on with the business of cleaning up our waters.

THE ROLE OF THE CONSERVATION COMMUNITY

Speaking of getting on with the business of water clean up, you—the conservation community—have a critical role to play in this work. In a decade which is unparalleled in American history for achievements in the field of conservation you have already been remarkable leaders. Much has been done, but much more lies ahead. Now we must quicken the pace. The future role of the conservation community must be more active than the past. Together we must work to:

(1) Create a climate of public opinion that demands clean water and higher environmental quality.

(2) Assist the states and Federal Government in setting the remaining water quality standards.

(3) Support needed legislative tools and generate public acceptance of them. We need your leadership to enact the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1968, now pending before Congress. It will enable us to fund the construction grant program at the actual level of authorization. We need your help to back state legislation and funding of clean water measures.

(4) Create institutions to plan and manage our water and wastes. Keep up your support for watershed associations, river basin compacts, state-wide management bodies for water and waste, and use of land.

(5) Help fill the gap in manpower needed to operate America's water and waste management systems. Encourage people to pursue careers in conservation and pollution control, and support better salaries for these important jobs. Help educate youth in the attitudes and skills necessary to protect and improve America's natural heritage.

(6) Monitor water quality and the whole program to set, implement, and enforce water quality standards.

I regard the conservation community as an extension of our surveillance and early warning system to prevent ecological disasters and promote environmental quality.

You are the first line of defense in protecting our living space against unnecessary unthinking and destructive incursions of man's activities.

Focus public attention on trouble spots—inadequately built or operated waste treatment plants, industrial carelessness, government oversight. Keep up the political pressure for conservation, pollution control and environmental quality on all levels of government.

I have outlined a number of ways the conservation community can help protect the quality of our environment.

There is still another area where your action, combined with Government's, can help assure that national policies can cope with national environmental problems.

There is a gap today, and a serious one, in our reporting and review of national resource and environment policy. For national economic and defense affairs we have a system of an annual Executive Branch report on

problems and policies, then Legislative Branch review and hearings on this report and analysis by an informed community of policy analysts.

The Defense Department conducts yearly posture hearings before the Appropriations and the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate. The Defense statement and Congressional hearings are then discussed and criticized by the press and also by the network of defense and foreign policy research centers which have grown up since World War II in universities, industry, and non-profit research organizations.

A comparable system also exists for economic matters where the Council of Economic Advisers prepares a periodic statement on the United States' economy—the Economic Report of the President—which is then the subject of hearings before the Joint Economic Committee. The report and hearings are then discussed by the press and by a strong network of economic policy analysts in universities and research organizations.

But for resources and environment, there is no such system for analysis. I do not think we can delay having one any longer.

Our resource problems are too complex, and effects of failing to solve them too disastrous to allow a gap in analysis.

We need this system of examination to assure that our policies are adequate for the complex and growing resource and environment problems.

We need a system to assure in the Executive and Legislative Branches coordination and continuity of various aspects of environment and resource policy. A recent study by the Library of Congress lists some 38 parts of the Executive Branch and some 24 standing committees of Congress concerned with water problems alone. Coordinated policies under such a structure require a sustained and persistent review.

The reporting and hearing mechanism would expand considerably the public's awareness of the complex resource problems. The whole resource picture, the total natural environment would be considered as a unit, as it really is, not fragmented artificially into separate pieces for study. One resource would be related to another, one form of pollution to another.

We have come to realize lately the critical importance of ecology—the inter-relatedness of things. The public wants to know more about ecological problems, and, indeed, the public must have sufficient information of this kind to permit fully rational land, water and air use decisions.

I suggest that this Nation needs, and you support, a system at the federal level which sets forth, on a regular, periodic basis, our conservation and resource policies for discussion, debate and decision by the people of the United States. The process must become permanent—institutionalized.

The system would work like this:

(1) The Executive Branch would issue an annual report on the status of resource problems and policies.

(2) Congress would then hold hearings on this report to assess whether the policies are adequate for the problems.

(3) The report and hearings should be discussed and analyzed by the press, the public, the conservation community, and other groups concerned with resource policy. This examination should be backed up by a strong network of centers for resource policy analysis, located at universities as well as in non-profit and commercial research organizations.

To date, only scattered elements of this system exist, and, if we are to have better resource policy in the future, then we must—with the help of the conservation community—create such a system.

Insofar as we have, as a Nation, looked at our resource problems as a whole in the past—at their specific elements and inter-

actions—we have done so intermittently, in an ad hoc fashion, through periodic study commissions which looked at the resource problem or part of it, issued their reports and recommendations and then disbanded. The reports and the recommendations, for the most part, have gathered dust on the shelves.

For example, over the past 35 years, we have had—

The National Resources Board and Advisory Committee in 1934;

The National Resource Committee in 1935;

The National Resource Planning Board from 1939 to 1943;

The Water Resources Policy Commission (Cooke Commission) under President Truman in 1950;

The Materials Policy Commission (Paley Commission) in 1952;

The resource proposals contained in the first and second Hoover commissions;

The Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy under President Eisenhower;

The Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources in 1960.

After each body made its report, it disbanded.

As a result, we have lacked the continued analysis of overall resource policies—by both the Executive and Legislative Branches—which effective resource and environmental policy requires.

As I see it the conservation community can have an important part in creating and sustaining this needed institutional system for resource management.

Here's what you can do:

(1) Be strong and vocal in support of this periodic report on total resource problems which is then the subject of hearings.

(2) Act to create the strong network of centers to analyze and criticize and offer new answers to our resource problems and policies.

(3) When the system begins to operate, the conservation community must help analyze and criticize the statements of problems and of the actions proposed to deal with them, and offer new answers.

Let me conclude with this charge: Do not drop the banner for a quality environment. You—the conservation community—were the vanguard in the fight for clean water when it began. Your cause has now been accepted. According to recent polls nearly 90% of the American people support a vigorous clean water and clean air program.

But you must not become complacent, or feel your job is done. More than ever we need you. You must continue in the forefront of this fight—for it will continue, in different arenas, perhaps, but it will continue—until environmental quality becomes a permanent consideration in American life. We have laid the ground rules—the water quality standards—for the next stage of the clean water fight. Learn the new ground rules and move forward by them—vigorously, positively, and undaunted.

A MEASURE OF PURPOSE

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the honor and privilege to attend an Armed Forces Day celebration in the city of Dallas, Tex.

I was particularly impressed by the major address of that occasion, made by Army Chief of Staff Harold K. Johnson. General Johnson was introduced by the former commander of the U.S. Military

Assistance Command, Vietnam, Lt. Gen. Paul D. Harkins, who began his service career by being appointed to the U.S. Military Academy in 1925, and graduated in 1929.

When the United States entered World War II, General Harkins was on duty as Brigade S-3 of the 1st Cavalry Brigade, Fort Bliss, Tex. In October 1942 he participated in the American invasion of North Africa as deputy chief of staff of the Western Task Force.

After the decision was made in 1943 to invade Sicily, General Harkins, as deputy chief of staff of the 7th U.S. Army, helped work out the invasion plan. During the last year and a half of World War II operations in Europe he served as the deputy chief of staff of the 3d U.S. Army, commanded by the late Gen. George S. Patton, Jr. For a few months following the end of the war, he was deputy chief of staff of the 15th U.S. Army in Europe.

During the Korean war, General Harkins served as chief of staff of the 8th U.S. Army from April to December 1953, when he became commanding general of the 45th Infantry Division. In March 1953, he assumed command of the 24th Infantry Division, also stationed in Korea.

General Harkins was appointed in August 1954 as deputy assistant chief of staff G-3 for International Affairs for the Department of the Army. On July 25, 1955, he was appointed assistant chief of staff G-3, the Department of the Army. When the Department of the Army general staff was reorganized in early 1956, he became assistant deputy chief of staff for Military Operations.

From Washington, D.C., General Harkins went to Turkey as commanding general of NATO's Allied Land Forces, Southeastern Europe, on August 22, 1957. He became deputy commander in chief and chief of staff, U.S. Army, Pacific, in September 1960, and assumed his post as commander of U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam, in 1962.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to have General Johnson's speech, as well as General Harkins' excellent introduction of the Army Chief of Staff, made a part of the Record, in order that all of us might be reminded of the great debt we owe this outstanding body of officers who have been produced by our American military system. I commend these remarks to my colleagues:

A MEASURE OF PURPOSE

(Address by Gen. Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, Armed Forces Day luncheon, Dallas, Tex., May 17, 1968)

One of the finest and least heralded blessings of an occasion like this is the opportunity it gives us to reflect. On this Armed Forces Day I will measure the Army against the standard of our national purpose. To my knowledge, the best statement of our national purpose is the Preamble to the Constitution.

In case you have forgotten, the Preamble goes like this:

"We, the people of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common Defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

There are six special items in that paragraph that I want to use as a checklist to measure the Army. The first of these is "We, the people . . ."

The Army is people—Americans by birth or by adoption—the boy next-door—the youngster down the street. Our leaders come not from the landed nobility nor from families of wealth and influence. They come from both high and humble homes. Many more of them graduate from colleges and universities across our land than from the Military Academy at West Point. Some, not yet college graduates, come from officer candidate schools or up through the ranks. As an overview, Army people average about 22½ years of age, and most of them enter the Army as privates and second lieutenants. They are bigger, tougher and better educated than were the men of my generation. Fewer of them are court-martialed and less drop out from psychiatric disorders than was the case with their fathers and older brothers of World War II and Korea.

The Army measures its strength in people—not in weapons or machines. The fact that these people come from every segment of our society gives us just what we need—an Army of, by and for the people. I deplore the thought some have advanced that we should abandon the draft and shift to an all-professional Army. If we were to do that, inevitably we would create a gap with the people the Army is designed to serve. That is just the opposite of what we want to do. Today, the American people are the Army's conscience and the Army is the servant of the people who support and sustain the Army. That, in my opinion, is just the way it ought to be.

The first national purpose laid out in the Preamble is, "... to form a more perfect Union . . ." Nothing could more accurately describe the original—and a continuing—purpose of our Armed Forces. Even before the Nation was, these fighting men were. From New England to Georgia—13 widespread colonies in all—they were called up and committed before their cause had a formal name. They were earning battle streamers before they had a national flag on which to hang them. They won independence for the colonies before the colonies could form a union. But—and this is a point never to be forgotten—once the Nation had been welded and hammered into shape, its Army and Navy were recast time after time in the national image. They have grown up in the likeness of the people they helped hold together in a union which, though tried in blood and fire, continues to withstand the test of time.

A second national purpose stated in the Preamble is, "... to establish justice and insure domestic tranquility . . ." Many people think of an Army only in terms of waging a war. Actually, our Army has a much broader mission—one that has an objective beyond any war. Just as the soldier swears to uphold the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic, so do our Armed Forces stand ready to respond to requests for assistance from civil authority when law enforcement agencies at the city, state, and federal civilian levels prove inadequate for the task.

Our forefathers quickly recognized the simple fact that if the American purpose was to amount to anything, the young Republic must first survive as a nation. Thus we see the words "... provide for the common defense . . ." delineating a third and very practical purpose in the Preamble.

The concept of a common defense has, of course, changed as our Nation grew. In those early days the young government took itself to defend its newly formed union of former colonies—with the help of the militia. As we gained stature as a nation, the American vision spread across our continent and took root in the hearts of men in other lands.

As America grew she assumed her rightful responsibilities as a member of the family of nations. And, as the distance between nations lost its efficiency as an insulator, the concept of a common defense evolved into our present policy of collective security—one implied since 1939 and formally in being since the close of World War II. So, as surely and as sincerely as our forefathers pledged their new government to provide for the common defense of every part of their newly formed nation, America today pledges with other freedom-loving nations to join in common defense against aggression. America knows, as do her partners, that a single nation cannot stand alone against a determined aggressor. Quite often a concerned citizen asks—as he should—why we fight on foreign soil. There to, survival is our aim. But in modern war, the farther away we can man our defenses, the more secure we become at home.

When the framers of our Constitution included the phrase, "Promote the general welfare" in the Preamble, they had no way of knowing how great a role the Army would play. But hardly had the Revolution been won before the young Republic was using its small military force to explore beyond the Appalachians, make maps, and build roads. The Military Academy at West Point, established in 1802, was the Nation's first engineering school. Its sons were to accomplish such peacetime feats as the digging of the Panama Canal, the building of the Alaskan Highway, and countless improvements to the rivers and harbors of a growing country. It was Army medical men who conquered yellow and typhoid fever, developed the chlorination of water, blood plasma substitutes, and flame-proof fabrics. An Army officer managed the Manhattan project in World War II that developed the atomic bomb. The Army's team of scientists developed and launched the Free World's first artificial satellite in 1958.

The list of such accomplishments—colateral contributions to the general welfare made while the Army was pursuing its primary missions—is much too long for recitation here. The point to remember is that our Armed Forces have always been committed to the principle that economic and scientific growth is as indispensable to national defense as battalions, battleships, and missiles. This is just the philosophy you might expect in a military force that is the servant and not the master of the people who nurture it.

The Preamble's concluding national purpose—the last but certainly not the least proviso—is to "... secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and posterity. ..."

What does the word secure mean?

Popular usage in recent years has given it the connotation of "to get" or "to obtain." A more proper meaning is to make safe, to guard, to protect; or to make sure, certain, firm. That is what the writers of the Constitution had in mind. They knew that the colonies did not have to bind together and fight to *get* or *obtain* freedom. Freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of the press were accepted facts in our colonies, long before they were formally guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. Our colonial forefathers were among the freest people in the world at that time. They fought not to obtain freedom but to retain—to *secure*—the liberty they already had.

What they fought to make secure, we have inherited. But with that inheritance we must also accept the responsibility to see that all our national purposes continue to stand firm and secure. But that is not all. It has been well said that "Freedom is never an accomplished fact. It is always a process." By the same token, the building of a democratic nation is a continuing process. Each generation of Americans must continue the work of completing the unfinished edifice of democracy. And, just as we are dwelling in

a structure whose walls have not yet been completely raised, whose spires are still reaching higher, we are also privileged to enjoy a freedom for which payment will never be completed. We are buying freedom on the installment plan. When men cry for freedom and peace in the same breath, they are asking for a blessing for which we must work and pray yet a little longer. Every generation of Americans may be required to pay its installment in the currency of personal sacrifice, and the people of each generation will not be prepared to make that sacrifice unless they care enough to become personally involved.

President Johnson just recently reaffirmed this thought in these words:

"Freedom and peace in the United States can only be secured if America remains involved in, and concerned with, the future of human freedom throughout the world."

That is why I tell our soldiers that when they leave the Service they must be responsible for their fellow citizens and become involved in the workings of their country. I have told our soldiers in Vietnam that they have a job to do there and another one waiting for them when they return to civil life—the job of becoming personally involved—not just *concerned*—but *involved*. That is why I tell young people at every opportunity that their task is not to discredit and discard everything that has been handed to them, but to analyze and reject the worthless while continuing to build on that which is consistent with high purpose.

That is why I now suggest that we measure all that we do as individuals against those noble purposes that are so well outlined for us as a people in the Preamble. Each of us can do this from time to time by simply asking the question: Does my personal brand of involvement help to form a more perfect union? Does it help provide for the common defense? Promote the general welfare?

Does it?

If the answer is no, or if we even hesitate before we can say yes, we had better find out where we jumped the track and lost our direction.

As nationally constituted we have purpose. The final question I would ask now is, are we, as a people, *purposeful*?

I want to read you a part of a letter written to me by a proud young widow, whose husband knew the meaning of purpose. She said:

"As a husband, father and soldier, he served those he loved with all the devotion and dedication one man might ever possess. I shall always be proud in knowing that his service in the United States Army and his supreme sacrifice were to further the cause of freedom and peace for our Country."

That husband-father-soldier had purpose in full measure. His wife has pride in his purpose and in the service for which he gave his life. You and I can take the same sort of pride in him and in the thousands like him whom we honor today—those who have served and those who are still serving in the uniform of their country so that we can enjoy the blessings of liberty and pass them on—undiminished—to generations yet unborn.

INTRODUCTION FOR GENERAL JOHNSON, ARMED FORCES DAY, DALLAS, TEX., MAY 17, 1968

Distinguished guests, Ladies and Gentlemen: We are delighted to welcome our guest speaker and his charming lady to Dallas. Indeed, it is an honor for all of us, and a particular honor for me, to introduce them.

Actually, General Johnson needs no introduction to this group. Most of us are familiar with his 35 years of distinguished service to our country. But I think it is more than appropriate to introduce Mrs. Johnson who for 33 years has been by his side—through his trials—tribulations—and his many successes. And I am sure that General Johnson himself would be the first to agree—more

than anyone else—that Dorothy has been a staunch arm to lean on through the years. Dorothy, will you please stand so that all can recognize the Chief of Staff to the Chief of Staff of the Army.

Born in North Dakota, General Johnson didn't believe in going west—he went east and graduated from West Point in 1933 as a 2nd lieutenant of Infantry. 1942, then a lieutenant colonel, found him on duty with the Philippine Scouts when Bataan fell. He made the famous death march and from '42 to '45 was a guest of the Jap Government prison camp system—serving in the Philippines, Japan and Korea.

Back in the U.S. in '45 and through the school system, including the Command and General Staff College and the Armed Forces Staff College.

1950 found him back in Korea where as an infantryman he commanded two Cavalry regiments. The Cavalry got even later when as a "dyed-in-the-wool" Cavalryman they sent me to Korea in '53 and let me command two Infantry divisions!

Back to the U.S., the National War College, and then to G-3, Department of the Army. As my executive officer he kept me out of jail. But we did so poorly they decided to change the name of G-3 to Chief of Staff for Military Operations.

Next we find time in Europe with the Seventh Army—then in CENTO with the NATO Command.

Back to the U.S. and a new honor—Commandant of the Command and General Staff College at Leavenworth.

Once again the Pentagon tentacles reached out and made him Deputy Chief of Staff for Military Operations and in July '64 he was appointed Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, the youngest since General MacArthur.

Looking over his fabulous career—he moved so often. I'm beginning to wonder if it was because he didn't pay his rent!

He has so many awards and decorations from home and abroad—they are too many to mention. I understand at a recent physical—after the Doc admired his many medals he asked him how he felt. The General said he felt a bit tired. After a complete exam, the Doc assured him everything was OK—he just had a bit of medal fatigue!

Among his other accomplishments he has four Honorary Degrees in Law, Education and Humanities.

He's active in the Boy Scouts—is a Silver Beaver and a Silver Buffalo.

He is a 33rd Degree Mason and a man of the Church.

You know these are people who live in America—but I want to present to you a Real American—General Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army.

IDAHOAN AWARDED MEDALS

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, today I was privileged to attend ceremonies at the Pentagon during which an Idahoan from my congressional district, Maj. Bruce D. Stocks, USAF, was awarded the Air Force Cross and also the Koren Kolligian, Jr., trophy.

This trophy, Mr. Speaker, was established in 1958 by Mr. and Mrs. Koren Kolligian from the State of Massachusetts, in memory of their son, the late Koren Kolligian, Jr., who was declared missing on an Air Force T-33 flight off the California coast in 1955. The trophy

has become one of the Air Force's most coveted awards for safety of flight and is presented annually to the aircrew member who responded most successfully to an emergency situation in flight during the year. Idahoans have every reason to be proud of Major Stock's record.

Mr. Speaker, under permission to include extraneous material, I include both the citation accompanying the Air Force Cross and the citation accompanying the award of the Koren Kolligian, Jr., Trophy:

CITATION TO ACCOMPANY THE AWARD OF THE AIR FORCE CROSS TO BRUCE D. STOCKS

Major Bruce D. Stocks distinguished himself by extraordinary heroism in connection with military operations against an opposing armed force as the pilot of an F-105 Thunderchief near Hanoi, North Vietnam, on 19 November 1967. On that date, Major Stocks led a flight assigned to suppress the surface-to-air missile threat for a twenty-ship strike force that had been directed to attack a strategic rail yard at the edge of Hanoi. He delivered his ordnance on the most threatening site and warned the strike force of imminent SAM attack. Due to his timely warning they were able to evade a salvo of missiles and depart the target area without battle damage. As Major Stocks turned to follow them out, shrapnel from an exploding surface-to-air missile hit his aircraft, wounding him in the chest and shoulder. When his wingman was hit seconds later, Major Stocks, in spite of his wounds, turned back toward the heavily defended target to successfully escort the damaged aircraft to a safe bailout area. Through his extraordinary heroism, superb airmanship, and aggressiveness, Major Stocks reflected the highest credit upon himself and the United States Air Force.

CITATION TO ACCOMPANY THE AWARD OF THE KOREN KOLLIGIAN, JR., TROPHY

The Koren Kolligian, Jr., Trophy is awarded to Major Bruce D. Stocks in recognition of his outstanding feat of airmanship in successfully coping with an emergency situation during a combat mission over North Vietnam.

Major Stocks distinguished himself by extraordinary achievement while participating in aerial flight on 19 November 1967. Major Stocks was the lead pilot in a flight of four F-105F aircraft attempting to suppress enemy radar controlled defensive weapons. While maneuvering near the target area, Major Stocks' and his wingman's aircraft were severely damaged by enemy surface-to-air missiles. Major Stocks sustained severe wounds in his left arm and chest. In addition, his radio was destroyed and the aircraft fuel system was damaged. Damage to the wingman's aircraft caused massive fuel syphoning which made an engine flame-out imminent. Despite his incapacitation, he quickly assessed the damage of each aircraft and escorted his wingman to a safe bailout area. After the crew ejected, Major Stocks provided protective air cover until search and rescue aircraft arrived on the scene. He then flew to a rendezvous with a post-strike tanker, and in face of the complications caused by the damaged fuel system, loss of radio, and effects of his wounds, Major Stocks was able to accurately assess the situation and successfully complete the inflight refueling after jettisoning his external fuel tanks. Major Stocks then flew several hundred miles back to his home base where he successfully recovered his damaged aircraft.

Major Stocks' outstanding feat of airmanship in successfully coping with this emergency while wounded and over enemy territory conforms to the highest standards established for the Koren Kolligian, Jr., Trophy and reflects great credit upon himself and the United States Air Force.

FATHER HESBURGH: AFTER 16 YEARS

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, this marks the 16th year of the presidency of the University of Notre Dame of Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C.

That the University of Notre Dame has made such extraordinary progress in developing itself as a center of excellence is in very large respect due to the diligence, the dedication, and the imagination and intelligence of this extraordinary man.

I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of an article in the May 19, 1968, issue of *Michiana*, the Sunday magazine of the South Bend Tribune, entitled "Father Hesburgh: After 16 Years," by Phil Ault.

The article follows:

FATHER HESBURGH: AFTER 16 YEARS
(By Phil Ault)

A few days before Easter, a University of Notre Dame student grumbled to Father Theodore Hesburgh, C.S.C., the university president, "I'm glad spring vacation is coming. This place is dull."

"Dull?" exclaimed Father Hesburgh, his black eyes snapping in surprise. "If you find this campus dull with all the things that are happening, you'll find the world is Dullsville the rest of your life."

Actually, Father Hesburgh is poorly prepared to discuss Dullsville. He's never been there.

His life is too crowded to permit moments of dullness. As he completes his 16th year as president of Notre Dame next month, a record tenure in that office, he is involved in so many activities on and off campus that in effect he leads two lives.

The lives are separate, and yet they are inextricably intertwined. One is his role as head of the best known Catholic university in the United States. The other is as a churchman of the world, which takes him away from the campus for many weeks every year.

Unquestionably, after 16 years under his direction, Notre Dame is in the greatest intellectual ferment of its 125-year existence. This yeasty bubbling is evident in its academic program, its social life, the extra-curricular pursuit of knowledge, and agitation among the student body for liberalized rules.

The university is immensely richer in physical plant and financial resources than the day Father Hesburgh became president.

Sixteen years is a long period for a man to preside over a major university. Especially this is true in tumultuous times such as these when higher education is undergoing double stress—the explosive expansion of man's knowledge, and aggressive demands by students for greater freedom and a larger voice in campus policies.

Notre Dame under Father Hesburgh has felt both these stresses.

UNIQUELY SUITED FOR THE PRESIDENT'S CHAIR

Over a thoughtful lunch recently, he looked back at his 16 years in office, considering how the university and its students have changed.

Now 50 (he will be 51 next Saturday), he has been in the president's chair since June 1952, just after his 35th birthday. The term for the presidency previously was six years. His talent and personality have proved so uniquely suited to the post that he holds a more or less indefinite appointment.

The years and the heavy demands of his job have brought touches of gray to the temples of Father Hesburgh's jet black hair. They have done little to reduce his pent-up energy, however. He gets along with little sleep, at times putting in an 18-hour day when the burdens of his multiple tasks pile up.

There is a quickness about him. His conversation is brisk. His answers to questions, even the complicated ones, are precise and come forth rapidly.

Walking bare-headed across the campus, he looks like a man in a hurry, as though pressed by the urgency to get more things done than the day's allotted 24 hours will permit.

Father Hesburgh is disturbed by the demands and behavior of some Notre Dame students, and is quite conscious that he personally has been the object of attack. Their chief criticism of him, expressed in student publications, is aimed at his frequent absence from the campus.

This criticism, he believes, is ill-founded and is based on two factors: a misunderstanding of the multiple role he plays in university and national affairs, and the natural tendency of the student activists to shoot at the man in charge.

As a specific example, he mentions complaints from a few students that when Martin Luther King died, Father Hesburgh didn't lead the Notre Dame students in a body to the downtown South Bend memorial ceremonies. St. Mary's College classes were dismissed for this purpose. The complainers thought Notre Dame should have been closed, too. They said nothing was done because Father Hesburgh was out of town.

"The day Martin Luther King was shot, I was in Washington attending a civil rights conference—the same goal he was working for," Father Hesburgh explained.

He is a member of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission and recently led the Vatican delegation to a special United Nations conference on human rights at Tehran, Iran.

"Isn't that doing as much for the cause, as leading a memorial march?"

Furthermore, had he been here at the time Father Hesburgh would not have closed Notre Dame for the day as a memorial gesture.

"The most important thing the university can do for the students is to make them competent," he explained. "They are here to learn. It costs \$130,000 a day to open the doors at Notre Dame, to teach them. I am against calling off classes as a gesture."

"People will say that we did so after we beat Oklahoma in football 10 years ago. We've grown up a bit since then."

NOTRE DAME'S GROWING STATURE

The striving for academic excellence recurs frequently in the president's conversation. With abundant evidence, he cites Notre Dame's growing stature in the eyes of educators as a seat of learning. The days when it was brushed aside by many as just a "football school" are long gone. Recently he instituted an intensive faculty study of the university's entire curriculum.

Father Hesburgh's concern with the student demands fits into this context. During his tenure the rigid restrictions on student conduct have been relaxed considerably. He finds himself unprepared, however, to give the agitators everything they want, because some demands violate what he regards as basic moral and administrative principles.

It is important to realize, he says, that the upsurge of college campus agitation about rules is nationally organized. What has been happening at Notre Dame is only a part of the nationwide activity.

The lists of student demands are similar everywhere in the United States, he contends. They are formulated by two groups, the Students for Democratic Action and the National Student Association.

"These national organizations set their goals each September, and circulate them across the country," Father Hesburgh ex-

plained. "They then pick certain schools as targets, where they think the chance of success is best."

Where do they get their money?

"That's a good question," he replied, "but I know they have lots of it."

As he views today's Notre Dame student body, only a very small segment—between 1 and 5 per cent, more likely around 2 per cent—of it can be described as activists. About 70 per cent are apathetic concerning the demands of the agitators, while the remaining 25 per cent are concerned with the issues raised but don't choose to take an active role in them.

"The agitator group always tries to get its people chosen as editors of the campus newspapers. That is part of the national pattern," he said. "This can be done by activists fairly easily."

Seemingly the demands of the current crop of student agitators are never satisfied. Having achieved one concession, they push for a further one, and then another.

This led to a hypothetical question: What if the university suddenly lifted all rules and restrictions, and gave the student activists everything they have ever asked?

Father Hesburgh's response was quick and succinct. "We probably would have to create some new rules to make them happy."

NOTRE DAME'S BEST STUDENT BODY EVER

Today's student body at Notre Dame is the best ever, in his judgment. "If I didn't think so, I wouldn't be here. The trouble is that 98 per cent of them are being judged by the conduct of the remaining 2 per cent."

Since his presidency has spanned a period of tremendous educational upheaval, Father Hesburgh inevitably finds differences between today's college students and those on the campus when he took office. He sees the current students as more knowledgeable but not necessarily more mature.

"They are more critical than their parents were, more idealistic and sensitive. They are more intellectually involved—ready to go out and work in the slums, that kind of thing. Also, they are more affluent."

The students are under greater intellectual pressure than their fathers were in their college days, as the sum of human knowledge multiplies at a spectacular rate. Father Hesburgh points out in his speeches that total human knowledge is doubling every 15 years. The need to distill this mass into teachable form, and the student's ability to absorb it, are challenging to everyone in the university.

"Freshmen today are getting mathematics that we used to start graduate students with, only 10 years ago," he cites in illustration.

Because he is absent from the campus so much on church, government, university fund-raising and academic projects, Father Hesburgh's personal relationship with the students is less frequent than that enjoyed by presidents of some other smaller universities.

This has been seized upon by the anti-administration activists in the student body. They have dramatized it by publishing pictures of the president's vacant chair in campus newspapers.

There are aspects of Father Hesburgh's bustling activity that these protestors either don't know, or choose to ignore.

Money, for example. Big money.

At a time when many private colleges and universities struggle to stay alive financially, Notre Dame is enjoying a mammoth physical expansion program. Faculty salaries have been rising, and so has the academic level.

Quite frankly, Father Hesburgh is a super-salesman in clerical garb. Super-salesmen don't get that way by sitting at the desk and shuffling papers. They're out calling on prospects.

HIS TERRITORY: THE WORLD

They know the territory. To Father Hesburgh, the territory is the entire United States; in fact, the world.

His list of memberships on boards and committees is enormous. As a sampling, he is a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the Vatican's permanent representative on the International Atomic Energy Agency, president of the International Federation of Catholic Universities, a member of the State Department's Policy Planning Council and the President's General Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance Programs. Plus, of course, his civil rights work.

One tends to forget Father Hesburgh's priesthood as the conversation plunges into global problems and financing. Youthful idioms and an occasional mild expletive sprinkle his discourse. The tone is more that of a corporation executive.

Then, just as naturally, the talk turns to a deep moral problem or a theological issue. He taught theology at Notre Dame before becoming executive vice-president in 1949. The fundamental religious commitment of his life never is far below the surface.

In the past 10 years, Father Hesburgh and the organization he has created have raised close to \$100 million for Notre Dame. This money has been used approximately half for physical plant, half for faculty improvement and academic strengthening.

Much of this money has come from foundations and industries, of which the \$15 million from the Ford Foundation is the largest single contribution. Nearly \$20 million has been contributed by Notre Dame alumni.

"Very few of these gifts are surprises, the kind that come in over the transom," the president explained.

"Many are the result of solicitations made 10 or 15 years ago. We work at it all the time, talking with potential donors, suggesting that gifts to the university be included in wills. We look everywhere for money. You never know where you will find it."

During the present "Summa" campaign to raise \$52 million, Father Hesburgh has visited many American cities. He speaks at meetings, talks with individuals, holds press conferences and makes TV appearances.

He talks about Notre Dame. As a priest, however, he has many questions thrown at him about the Catholic Church and the changes it is undergoing. These concern such matters as short skirts for nuns, birth control and clerical celibacy.

At a recent Los Angeles press conference, typically, he approved modern dress for nuns and the trend to allow them more freedom. He sees the current debate as leading to improvements in the church during the next decade.

"There will always be tension between those who want to go one way fast and those who want to go another way slowly," he said. His own views seem to favor change at moderate speed, within clearly-defined moral limits. This is a point at which he comes in conflict with the "anything goes" programs of the more ardent student agitators.

Father Hesburgh's personal contacts are enormous. He receives as many as 200 letters a day, in several languages.

From these contacts come leads that result in contributions.

PRIDE IN HIS PRODUCT

However, a salesman can't succeed on personality alone. He must have something to sell. That, perhaps, is the source of Father Hesburgh's greatest satisfaction—the product he is selling.

"The money raised has helped us to improve the university, and that in turn makes it easier for us to raise more. It all ties together. Things are happening here."

"Take a look at what we had on our campus in just one week this spring. The Sophomore Literary Festival with Norman Mailer, William Buckley and other writers of national prominence. Two candidates for president, Bobby Kennedy and Eugene Mc-

Carthy. And the Cities in Context conference, which included some of the world's finest planners."

"Think what it means for the students to have those things available to them."

The testy Mailer, usually a fighter against the establishment, called Notre Dame "one of the most exciting Catholic universities in America." He said he thought it was ready to see his hard-nosed movie about the police. It was.

The idea of Notre Dame being ready for Norman Mailer is surprising to many, and indicative of what is happening.

Another aspect of this continuous fund raising affects the well-being of more than half the students; in fact, many could not be in school without it.

Next year, 51 per cent of the school's undergraduate students will receive financial aid, averaging more than \$1,000 per man. Total aid given to students next year will be more than \$4 million.

The cost of attending the university for one year, including tuition and room, plus ordinary travel and personal expenses, is close to \$3,000. Eighty-five per cent of its students come from outside Indiana, and many have substantial travel expense. The availability of funds to help reduce this heavy burden is extremely important.

Father Hesburgh is a night worker. If he weren't, he almost certainly would not be able to carry the load he does. He talks with many students in his office late at night. Often the sessions last long after midnight. For him, 2 a.m. is an early bedtime.

Frequently he spends the business day in New York or Washington, catches a plane back to South Bend in the evening and puts in six hours at his desk in his simple, high-ceilinged office under Notre Dame's golden dome. He dictates at high speed into a machine, and writes special things in longhand, in several languages.

A SITTING DUCK

"I'm a sitting duck," he grins. "My office light is on, there is no secretary around, a student can see I'm here, and walks in to say hello."

Some nights, he has as many as 20 student visitors. These mutually stimulating sessions may last until 2 or 3 a.m., and are one of Father Hesburgh's best ways to keep in touch with the campus mood.

Immediately after one such recent visit, in which he and a student discussed the moral aspects of campus rules until 4 a.m., Father Hesburgh wrote a long and emotional pre-dawn letter to all students. In it he announced his decision on disciplining four students who violated campus rules.

He expressed emphatically his position on campus conduct, particularly demands for admission of women to the men's dormitory rooms.

"I may be naive, but I think it possible for men to be educated in the company of women without the necessity of having women in their dormitory rooms," he wrote.

"If this makes me medieval, I'll live with that and ask you all to pray for my replacement by someone more modern."

He quoted the advice given him by Father John Cavanaugh, his predecessor as president. Father Cavanaugh told him that administration is simple if you remember one rule: when making decisions ask yourself what is right—not what is popular, expedient, economical, but what is right.

"Do that and you will sleep nights," the older priest told his young successor.

Recalling this, Father Hesburgh added:

"I've tried to do it that way. I haven't had trouble sleeping; just getting to bed. I love this place and I want it to be the best, as Catholic universities go."

"I don't want it to be a large moral ambiguity, a place where students are unconcerned with values, a place where the real Christian community is not perceived and sensed. Only you students can make Notre

Dame all of these things that the world desperately needs today.

"If what I have done tonight leads in that direction, I'll sleep with the dawn now coming up outside my office windows. The birds are already singing and it is light again. Another day—may it be a good one."

Perhaps these words, written swiftly at 5:30 a.m. after a night of talk, summarize as well as any Father Hesburgh's feeling about the university after 16 years as its leader.

GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, false images create many of our troubles today.

There can be no pot of gold at the foot of the rainbow for anyone just for the asking. Measures passed the last few years in the Congress have created false images by making people believe that they can have something for nothing. This simply is not true.

We must develop our minds to project the image that it is better to dream and aspire to get ahead on one's own, rather than depend on a handout.

And, a guaranteed annual income is just another false image—completely unrealistic and impossible.

An editorial appeared in the Knoxville Journal on Tuesday, June 4, 1968, entitled "Guaranteed Annual Income Involves Danger to Nation," and I will just pass it along to the readers of the RECORD:

GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME INVOLVES DANGER TO NATION

Recently a recommendation has been signed by 1000 economists on various campuses that the federal government, or Congress, to be specific, enact legislation to provide an annual income for all unemployed citizens or families and also to supplement the incomes of working citizens by amounts sufficient to bring their incomes up to a minimum to be determined by the federal establishment.

At the present writing, the Office of Economic Opportunity has laid down the following schedule of minimum income for individuals and families. If the incomes of citizens or families fall below these minima they are deemed to be poverty-stricken:

Persons:	Income
1.....	\$1,600
2.....	2,000
3.....	2,500
4.....	3,200
5.....	3,800
6.....	4,200
7.....	4,700
8.....	5,300
9 ¹	5,800

¹ Add \$500 for each additional person.

GUARANTEED INCOME

Some of the thinkers on this subject would legislate a guaranteed annual income for every family by use of the so-called negative income tax. Such a tax would call for the U.S. Treasury to hand over to the head of any family with income less than the minimum established by statute the amount by which it failed to be subject to federal income taxation.

Without adopting any specific plan, the economists said that supplemental income

payments should be based solely on need related to family size and that the system should provide incentives for higher earned income.

Spokesmen for it said such a plan, however implemented, "would automatically achieve two sought-for but heretofore unattainable goals—need as a basis for financial assistance and a uniform national minimum standard."

Under most of the proposed plans, payments would be made whether a recipient worked or not. It is estimated by some that about one third of the nation's roughly 30,000,000 poor, as now defined by the government, are in families with a full-time bread winner who earns low wages. Incomes in these cases would be supplemented.

BACKED BY DR. FRIEDMAN

It is of passing interest that one of the earliest supporters of the guaranteed income theory was Dr. Milton Friedman, a University of Chicago economist and a conservative who supported Barry Goldwater for President in 1964.

In a television interview last year Dr. Friedman was asked, "How can we improve the incomes of the poor?"

"Give them money," said Dr. Friedman.

As an offshoot from this central idea of supplementing the income of the poor from the federal Treasury, there has even been advanced a proposal that there be a congressional enactment to the effect that after any mother gives birth to a maximum of three children she would be paid a bonus of \$500 per year so long as she gave birth to no additional progeny.

All of the above, which is now becoming a matter of public debate though the subject has been discussed for several years, is worthy of the reader's attention and thought because it is in this way that all ideas for legislation finally come to either defeat or fruition.

PASSAGE UNLIKELY NOW

Offhand it would appear that none of the proposals outlined above would be likely to gain the approval of any Congress for a variety of reasons.

For example, a high official of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations had this to say: "Support for this kind of plan just does not exist and could not exist in a work-oriented culture." This was his view, though the labor movement has taken no official position on income supplement plans of any kind but seems unlikely to support them. It will be noted, however, that there is pending before the current session of Congress a recommendation from the Johnson Administration on a rent supplement plan which is at least a first cousin of the universal plan dealt with above.

QUESTIONS ARISE

That there should be public discussion on what seems at first glance to be such a "far out" proposal is, first of all, an almost universal recognition of the fact that the existing welfare system is not only failing to reach many who need it most, but is also constructed in such a way as to be self-perpetuating. The dole, or handout, in many cases based upon specious or downright immoral pretexts, cannot fail to blunt incentive on the part of the individual and to destroy human dignity.

In addition, one of the first questions which come to the mind of the individual, especially the one whose taxes help to support the existing welfare systems at a cost of \$8,000,000,000 per year, is whether any such plan as is discussed here would substitute for or be in addition to the dole now being handed out to several millions of our citizens.

Furthermore, perhaps the major concern about this proposal, now only in the talking stage, is its political relationship. If the families of the estimated 30,000,000 persons

now under the OEO poverty minima suddenly became recipients of federal money, they would automatically constitute a new and powerful political group with which politicians generally would have to cope.

FALSE ASSUMPTIONS SEEN

Observation of the way such groups with common interests coalesce into potent political or lobbying forces foretells what would happen if an annual guaranteed income were adopted. First, there would be a demand laid before every Congress to increase the minimum figures now decreed by the federal establishment as the demarcation line between poverty and adequate income. Every recipient would insist upon increase of the minimum on the same theory that wages in private industry and government are hiked, with inflation and so on being used as arguments. If Congress yielded to these demands, it would automatically add to the number of those eligible for annual handouts from Uncle Sam and would measurably increase the drain on working taxpayers and the political pressure for more and bigger income guarantees.

As noted above, we believe the verdict as to the existing welfare system to be that it is a failure, loused up by a multitude of false assumptions and in some cases plain fraud. However, the question may arise as to whether the ideas for "reform" discussed here would aggravate or relieve the present situation.

It will occur to a good many readers that the guaranteed annual income proposal, if and when it should ever be adopted as national policy, could represent the final plunge into Socialism toward which a long step has already been taken through the Social Security system.

RETIRED RESERVE GIVEN NO RECOGNITION

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the law is now written so that many dedicated retired military people who have given years of service in active duty and in the Reserve Forces of this Nation are treated as second-class citizens.

It so happens that when a man is transferred to the Retired Reserve list without pay and allowances, he is given none of the recognition to which his long record of service should entitle him. I do not speak of actual pay or the traditional fringe benefits which go to a man in the military service on the retired list, but simply to the little bits of recognition which a grateful nation should give to those who have served so long.

Mr. Speaker, one of the finest Americans I have ever known happens to have been born in Russia and has served faithfully in the U.S. Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve since 1916. I have never known any man to be more loyal to his country and to have done a better job of promoting good citizenship than Col. Mark Tuban, now transferred to the Retired Reserve list of the Marine Corps Reserve. He has long been active in the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association, was active with the Benevolent Protective Order of Elks in promoting citizenship, and continues to this day to

render service to the Marine Corps and his Nation at every opportunity.

Recently Colonel Tuban wrote a letter to Col. Thomas R. Wert, executive secretary of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association, which adequately explains the problem I have been discussing. I am proud to submit Colonel Tuban's letter herewith:

MAY 21, 1968.

COL. THOMAS R. WERT,
U.S. Marine Corps, Retired, Executive Secretary, MACROA, Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLONEL: It was a pleasure to attend the last MACROA Conference, visit with you and many old combat comrades. Our conferences are improving each year, particularly the ones conducted at W.D.C. Congratulations!

You will recall that during the banquet night, we briefly discussed the matter I will try to cover, and which you requested of me to write you about.

During mid 1959, when I was most busy commanding a language V.T.U. unit, at Moffet N.A.S., a letter reached me from Headquarters, advising me that I was past statutory retirement age, and requesting of me a letter of resignation, etc. My reply was: "I am in excellent health, love my assignment and will not voluntarily resign." Consequently, on November 1, 1959 I was the recipient of a large plaque, and a two page mimeographed letter, with a stamped signature "R. Mc C. Pate", informing me that I was "transferred to the Retired Reserve list of the M.C. Reserve, without pay and allowances".

I never contested or checked out the above notice as I didn't care, or do not now care anything pertaining to "pay and allowances". My dedication to the Marine Corps, I hope has always been above that.

As I continued with my normal participations in behalf of the M.C., I began to note that "without pay" had a great significance, and not particularly in monetary values alone.

Perhaps the best example of my feelings was when attending the 1967 MACROA Conference in Anaheim. I suddenly became ill. My Marine friends rushed me to the El Toro dispensary, however legally, they were not able to admit a "without pay" retired Marine, even in an emergency. This made me feel as a *Second Class Citizen*, rather than a veteran who has been at his country's call since 1916. (I started in the U.S. Army). Similarly, I feel frustrated and embarrassed when I travel in behalf of the Military, and find that "without pay" has sort of a stigma and prevents me from purchasing items of clothing, uniforms, supplies or liquors, and sometimes even quarters.

Approaching seventy-three, the "Second Class Citizenry" tag effects and discourages me. However, the good old Marine Corps keeps on calling upon me for services. At present, I am the Santa Clara County Civic Action Committee Chairman, and am devoting considerable time, money and effort to this project, as well as other Marine causes, such as R.O.T.C. recruiting, etc.

To be repetitious, I am not interested in any monetary benefits connected with my retirement, fortunately I do not need them, or Medicare. However, I do need the feeling that I am not a *Second Class Citizen*, and that is priceless. In fact, should there be any money due me, I'll deed same to MACROA, or the Marine Military Academy, where I hope to send my grandson and name sake in the fall of 1968. He will be the third generation of Tubans in the M.C.

Now that I have gotten this off my chest, my kindest personal regards to you and yours! Let me hear from you.

Sincerely,

MARK R. TUBAN,

Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Marine Corps.

CXIV—1131—Part 14

A CIRCUIT COURT JUDGESHIP FOR OREGON?

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, on June 10 final congressional action was taken to clear the bill S. 2349 for the President's signature. This measure adds four judges to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals is a nine-State circuit. An Oregonian has not been represented on this circuit bench since 1959, a fact that has been of some concern to Oregonians. With the addition of four judgeships to this court there will be 13 judges on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. It would seem equitable that at least one of these new positions be given to an Oregonian. There is no lack of highly qualified candidates.

The newspapers, the Portland Oregonian and the Oregon Journal recently dealt with this subject in two important editorials, which I present at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Oregonian, June 12, 1968]

SEAT FOR OREGON?

The congressional action, completed Monday, adding four judges to the Ninth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals should ensure the elevation of an Oregonian to that court.

Oregon has not been represented on the appeals court since the 1959 death of James Alger Fee; yet it sends as many cases to the court as the district courts in Idaho, Montana and Nevada, all of which are represented. In recent years, politics have snagged any possible appointments from Oregon, despite the existence of qualified candidates. But with four new vacancies, even political considerations can scarcely excuse overlooking this important segment of the appeals court's jurisdiction.

The new seats, which will bring the total on the nine-state court to 13, are unquestionably needed. The Ninth Circuit's case load has increased more than 75 per cent since 1954, when the size of the court was increased from seven to nine judges. All 18 senators of the nine states involved sponsored the legislation to bring the panel to 13.

Sometime in the future, it may become advisable to create a new appeals court to serve the Pacific Northwest, as has been long promoted by Washington's Senators Warren Magnuson and Henry Jackson. But Oregon bench and bar have been cool to that suggestion. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has served Oregon well. But the view here could change should Oregon candidates for the court continue to be ignored.

[From the Oregon Journal, June 14, 1968]

IT'S TIME FOR AN OREGON JUDGE

Oregon's hopes of regaining direct representation on the federal Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit are renewed with passage by Congress of a bill enlarging the court from 9 judges to 13. Judge John F. Kilkenny of the Oregon Federal District Court would be an excellent choice for one of the appointments.

Judge Kilkenny was a candidate for the higher court last year, to fill a vacancy left by a retirement, but instead President Johnson appointed James M. Carter of San Diego. That left the court's composition at four judges from California and one each from every one of the other eight states in the circuit except Oregon and the two newest states, Alaska and Hawaii.

More than local pride is involved in seeking

to have an Oregon judge on the court. Many times federal appeals judges must interpret state law and be familiar with the ruling of state and federal trial courts. Yet not since the death of Judge Bert E. Haney 25 years ago has an Oregon-trained judge been a member of the federal appeals court for the Far Western circuit, except for the five years, 1954 to 1959, when the late James Alger Fee was on the appeals court. Oregon has a strong claim to be considered this time.

Judge Kilkenny, 66, has the backing of the two other federal district judges for Oregon, Gus Solomon and Robert Belloni, neither of whom is a candidate. In his 33 years of active law practice in Eastern Oregon he became one of the state's leading trial lawyers, and served a term as president of the Oregon State Bar. In nine years as a federal district judge he has been energetic and competent, and has served as a visiting judge in both circuit and district federal courts elsewhere.

President Johnson will make the appointments to fill the new judgeships, and the Senate will be asked to confirm them. Judge Kilkenny would be a good choice for one of the positions.

CRIME IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, the FBI crime index figures indicate that the number of crimes committed in 1967 was 3,750,000, almost 4½ times the number committed in 1944. This was an increase of 367 percent, while our population was increasing by only 44.6 percent. It is no wonder that the people of this Nation are demanding that positive action be taken when our crime rate is increasing at eight times the rate of population growth. The situation is not improving—the sharpest increase for any 1 year occurred in 1967 with an increase of 16 percent. It is expected to go even higher in 1968.

Unless this situation is checked and reversed, America will become a land in which decent citizens will no longer wish to live, work, and raise their families. The citizens of our great country can no longer endure each night in fear for the safety of themselves and their families. It is way past time that the Congress rectify this situation.

If there is to be a meaningful attack on our national crime problems, it must include concerted attention to the law-enforcement process. Last week, I introduced bills designed to attack the problem of organized crime. The bills that I introduce today would provide law-enforcement officials with some needed tools in the apprehension and prosecution of criminals. These bills would give our law-enforcement agencies the legal authorization to do the jobs vested in them by the public.

The first bill applies specifically to the area of search and seizure. As I pointed out last week organized crime is a national problem of the highest priority. It is using its gigantic earning power to infiltrate every facet of American society.

Of particular concern is the flourishing gambling and narcotics traffic. Here are

two highly professional criminal areas of operation where evidence is of extreme importance for convictions. This evidence under present laws can be easily disposed of at the time of a search by officers. Court records are full of cases in which incriminating evidence is thrown out of windows, poured down drains, or flushed down toilets when an officer executing a warrant makes the statutory announcement of his presence prior to entry. Another example is that of gambling slips which can be produced on "flash" paper that goes up in smoke in a few seconds at the touch of a match.

Thus, due to its peculiar nature, evidence of gambling and narcotics is easily disposed of and often lost forever as incriminating evidence.

Clearly there is a need in these cases for our law-enforcement officials to be able to enter a place to be searched without delay and without announcement. The bill that I introduce would grant authority to officials to enter premises to be searched without announcement or identification if there is strong reason to believe that evidence to be seized would be destroyed. This approach has already been enacted into law in the State of New York, and I feel it essential that Federal officers share this authority.

Mr. Speaker, stolen motor vehicles pose another problem in the area of search and seizure. Since 1960 there has been a 71-percent increase in auto thefts. In 1966 there was one auto theft every 57 seconds and the preliminary figure for 1967 indicates a 17-percent rise above the 1966 level.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover declares that auto theft for resale is one of America's major rackets. Only about one out of four auto theft cases is solved, so exact statistics are not obtainable; but some authorities estimate that 50 percent of these thefts are by professionals.

Stopping professional car-theft rings requires careful police work in apprehension and prosecution of offenders.

Mr. Speaker, the second bill that I introduce would provide a simple increase in the inspection power of law-enforcement officials. Federal officials now can inspect many items in interstate commerce including motorboats, ferryboats, hazardous chemicals, foodstuffs, and so forth. This legislation would allow an inspection by law-enforcement officers of the serial numbers of the body or motor of a motor vehicle for the purpose of determining whether or not it is stolen. This power would not be dependent upon an arrest or a search warrant, but would simply be an inspection made by an officer who had a reasonable suspicion that the vehicle was being transported in violation of the law. An altered identification number, or a number that did not correspond to registration papers, or that was known to be that of a stolen vehicle would easily establish whether or not a theft had occurred.

If officers can inspect for the great number of purposes they do now, it would seem only logical that they have extended to them this simple power. The precedents are established, and the need is clear.

Mr. Speaker, 16 States have approved

"stop-and-frisk" procedures, which, by one means or another, permit police to stop suspicious persons, detain them for a short period of time, ask them questions and "frisk" them for weapons, if necessary, all without effecting a formal arrest, as long as the police have reasonable cause to do so.

At this time no Federal statute exists which extends this protection and this very valuable investigative tool to either Federal agents throughout the country or to the police in the District of Columbia. The action of the Supreme Court on June 11 in upholding these State laws has cleared the way for the Congress to give Federal agents and the police of the District of Columbia this much-needed authority.

Over the years such laws have proven decidedly useful for the prevention and detection of crime, for the obtaining of evidence and, most important, for the protection of police officers. The third bill that I introduce today would extend this authority to Federal agents and the police of the District of Columbia.

It would provide for the detection of a criminal and prevent crimes without the necessity of the long-drawn-out procedures now in effect.

With the recent passage of the safe streets and crime control bill, the Congress has recognized the great need to improve our ability to detect crime, apprehend criminals, and convict those who are guilty. It is my hope that the Congress will consider these bills that I have introduced and continue the effort to strengthen our society against the criminal elements which seek to destroy it.

HORROR IN NIGERIA

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very pertinent commentary by the international columnist Richard Pattee appeared on June 14 in the New World, the official newspaper of the Archdiocese of Chicago.

There is, Mr. Speaker, an unfortunate double standard in the world which Mr. Pattee's article very effectively demonstrates and the indifference of the world to the situation in Nigeria is truly shocking. May I point out that the indifference of the United Nations is equally disturbing.

I trust that this article will stimulate overdue interest to the struggle in Nigeria.

The article follows:

THIS WORLD OF OURS: A CASE OF STRANGE SILENCE ON HORROR IN NIGERIA

(By Richard Pattee)

Some weeks ago, the President of the Ivory Coast, Felix Houphouet-Boigny, declared in an interview and in a declaration to the people of his West African country that the conscience of the world badly needed to be shaken by the unfortunate events that were taking place in Nigeria.

I wrote a few lines on this subject some weeks ago, calling attention to the signifi-

cance of the recognition of Biafra and the prospects that this represented in terms of the integrity of the African states. But the statement of the President of the Ivory Coast, whose record of statesmanship and realism is outstanding, adds a somber note to the whole story of what is happening in Nigeria.

Houphouet-Boigny noted that the world was saying nothing about the horror that was taking place in Nigeria; that in six months there had been more deaths in that stricken land than in Vietnam since the beginning of hostilities; that the most barbarous methods were being employed by the Nigerian government to put down the rebellion and in the midst of it all, not a word of condemnation from the outside world, either in Africa or elsewhere.

It has been clear for months that the Lagos government has been using foreign planes with Egyptian pilots among others, to blast the Biafrans and devastate their towns and cities. This unbelievable intervention of mercenary pilots is infinitely more serious than the work of the small band of European mercenaries in the Congo of Belgian action at the time of the Stanleyville unpleasantness.

Yet, the world has said absolutely nothing about the Nigerian case. Houphouet-Boigny is almost the only voice, and his was vibrant with indignation, to speak out regarding a situation that has become intolerable.

More recently, the news of the entrance of the Nigerian federalists into Port Harcourt, has brought information about the ruthlessness with which the Ibo population of that port city has been treated.

The admirable thing about the statement of the President of the Ivory Coast is that he is a civilized statesman who makes no distinction between the inhumanity, be it committed by Europeans, Africans or Asians. He gets away from the financial idea that all of the inequities are peculiar to the western world and the virtues concentrated elsewhere.

He will probably not be popular in the extremist circles that are reluctant to accept the truth about Nigeria. But it is high time that his words find an echo elsewhere and especially in the halls of the United Nations where some minor infraction by a run-away Belgian in the bowels of the Congo produces cries of alarm whereas the systematic extermination of the Ibos in Nigeria merits only the most discreet silence.

The Egyptians in particular, who are extremely zealous about foreign intervention and pressures, are apparently immune to criticism when their pilots engage in the kind of activity now going on in Biafra.

Aside from the humanitarian aspect of this whole business, one can only regret that there are not a dozen Houphouet-Boignys in Africa. If there were, the continent would be a far different place from what it is today.

FOR MIGRATORY AGRICULTURAL WORKERS—VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1967 authorized a special program of grants to State vocational rehabilitation agencies to pay 90 percent of the cost of pilot or demonstration projects to provide rehabilitation services to disabled migratory agricultural workers and their families.

I believe every Member of this body is familiar with the depressing and often tragic circumstances under which most migrant workers and their families presently work and live. Not so well known, however, is the serious problems they face when the worker or a member of his family sustains a serious disability on top of his other problems.

The Congress already has taken several important steps to try to improve the lot of the migrant worker. However, the difficulties become literally overwhelming when the worker or family member becomes disabled, which happens frequently among this group.

It is well known that disability is always far more prevalent among low-income groups. Surely, we can all agree that this is one of the most economically deprived groups of workers in the United States. Disability appears with great frequency as a result of accidents at work and on the highways as they travel with the seasons from one crop to another.

The migrant workers receive none of the services which public programs bring to most citizens. Because they are "out-of-States" and are not eligible for the services that the community normally provides, they usually find themselves without a place to turn when disability strikes.

This new special program will help overcome many of the obstacles to rehabilitation of disabled migrant workers. The estimated migrant population in the United States, including families, is 2,000,000. Of this number, it is further estimated that at least 2 percent or 400,000 persons would be eligible and feasible for vocational rehabilitation services. A request for \$3.5 million is included in the 1969 budget. Although this sum will fund only a limited number of projects, it will initiate pilot and demonstration projects. In such projects some examples of the kinds of activities that might be included are:

First. Casefinding and referral systems at migrant agricultural worker labor centers, migrant health centers with appropriate linkage with State vocational rehabilitation agencies, schools, and other agencies. Such systems could involve workers, worker and community leaders, health labor and other public and voluntary agency people in identifying health, and referring potential clients for vocational rehabilitation services.

Second. Rehabilitation units in close cooperation with and proximity to migrant health centers to provide the necessary early coordinated and specialized evaluation and rehabilitation services.

Third. Cadres of indigenous worker aides, and camp ministers or other recognized spokesmen, to assist in casefinding, interpretative and other supportive services.

Fourth. Comprehensive training and placement programs to provide prevocational, vocational, and adjustment training, literacy and basic adult education and job placement.

Fifth. Additional staff to provide services, possibly including a social service staff. This could include loan of staff from regular caseloads during peak periods.

Sixth. Mobile evaluation and service teams, intrastate and interstate to function independently where other appropriate resources are not available, or in cooperation with other permanent or mobile resources. Individuals for whom evaluations and other services could not readily be provided by mobile teams could be transferred to service centers.

Seventh. Special cooperative service programs and business enterprises. Programs could be coordinated with other resources to provide comprehensive services. Business enterprises and industrial contracts could be developed.

Eighth. Services which could be best characterized as "instant" to facilitate prompt diagnosis, evaluation, and provision of services in the shortest period of time.

Ninth. Special service programs and teams for family unit rehabilitation, including vocational, social, psychological, and medical services and other disciplines, as appropriate.

Tenth. Cooperative referral and service programs involving two or more State vocational rehabilitation agencies.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Rehabilitation Services Administration, under the leadership of Commissioner Joseph Hunt, for swift action in initiating this new program. With the experience that will be gained from these demonstration projects, we will be able to proceed to truly offer and provide the necessary services to this group of people who have long been neglected. It will hopefully enable them to share in the fruits of the most prosperous Nation in the world today.

VIOLENCE PANEL A LOBBY FOR SOCIALISTS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the format for the new "violence panel" gives every indication that it will but prove to be another sounding board for the Socialist intellectuals of our country. Its conclusions can be anticipated in advance. Those actually at fault will be "white-washed" and those blamed will be the innocent American people.

Notably breakdown of law and order, the anti-American problem child—the Federal judiciary—the effects of forced race-mixing, and communism are not topics to be investigated.

Since the taxpayers are subsidizing all these Soviets, perhaps we can get a committee to investigate the role of past and present committees in fomenting violence.

I include the Post article of June 19:

VIOLENCE PANEL HOLDS FIRST WORKING SESSION

(By William Chapman)

The presidential commission studying violence in American life held its first working meeting yesterday and agreed to give President Johnson at least a preliminary report in December, before he leaves office.

The National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence met for three hours in the Capitol and announced it will concentrate on three forms of violence:

1. Assassinations, physical attacks and threats against public officials.

2. Violence associated with formal and informal groups, particularly "illegal mass action." A spokesman said this referred to rioters.

3. Violent crimes against persons by individuals or small groups.

The commission, appointed by President Johnson after the assassination of Sen. Robert F. Kennedy, met, ironically, in the Capitol's "John F. Kennedy Room," a parlor that President Kennedy used after his nomination in 1960.

A statement issued by its chairman, Milton S. Eisenhower, said the commission plans some public hearings later this summer. It plans to meet again "at least by July 10," Eisenhower said.

Mr. Johnson originally had set the commission's life at one year, but Eisenhower said the President has now requested a report by December. "We will do our utmost to put out at least an interim report by that time," Eisenhower said.

The commission will focus its investigation on gun controls, law enforcement, the influence of mass media, and "the historical, cultural, sociological, psychological, religious and other factors" bearing on violence, Eisenhower added.

Eisenhower, former president of the Johns Hopkins University, also announced the appointment of three top staff aides for the commission.

They are Thomas D. Barr, a New York City lawyer, as deputy to executive director Lloyd N. Cutler; James S. Campbell an associate in Cutler's law firm, as general counsel, and Air Force Col. William G. McDonald as administrative officer.

Eisenhower said the commission would study published and unpublished material dealing with violence and will consult with scholars "and people in other walks of life who have concerned themselves with the subject of violence."

"THE DECADES AHEAD FROM A PUBLISHER'S VIEW"—AN ARTICLE BY EDWARD E. BOOHER, PRESIDENT, MCGRAW-HILL BOOK CO.

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thoughtful citizens in the country is Edward E. Booher, president of McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Mr. Booher is a man much devoted to the cause of improving American education.

I think that Members of Congress will read with interest a recent essay of his entitled, "The Decades Ahead From a Publisher's View."

This article first appeared in the November 17, 1967, issue of Science magazine.

THE DECADES AHEAD FROM A PUBLISHER'S VIEW

(By Edward E. Booher, president, McGraw-Hill Book Co.)

What is the purpose of looking ahead 25 years? Is it an exercise in never-never-land thinking—making assumptions, guesses, and speculations which are sufficiently remote in time to avoid challenge? Perhaps it is, but it

may also be a handy cushion against imminent events that are more likely to occur in 5 or 10 years than in a quarter of a century.

Hence, it seems to me that the real usefulness of crystal-ball-gazing lies in the fact that it provides a frame of reference, a set of guideposts. Let me give you an example. Projections of gross national product are inevitably imperfect; they miss the mark by a finite percentage. But the ability to make the projection at all is tremendously valuable; the projections help us to understand our national economy and provide us with specific bench marks. We are indeed better able to deal with the future with an imprecise GNP projection than with none at all.

As I look at the publishing industry today I feel that its qualitative changes are at least as important as its quantitative growth and expansion. And because I feel the performance and attitude of publishers are of importance to our society I would like to speculate on the future as I perceive it. It is, I might say, a rosy future.

PREDICTIONS

I will start with a series of predictions.

(1) There will be no major war. A reduction in our military commitment in the next few years could free at least \$10 billion, and perhaps as much as \$25 billion, a year for other uses, and I think those other uses probably would be largely improvements in the educational and cultural aspects of our society. That would mean great opportunities for those of us who are supplying programs and materials for instruction and learning.

At the moment, however, all available funds are going into Southeast Asia, and the immediate chance for any large increase on the education front is remote. Despite this, and despite the fact that Congress is reluctant to appropriate funds for new things, it appears now that federal funds to be spent in fiscal 1968 to buy materials of instruction will be just as great as funds spent for this purpose in fiscal 1967, and that is very meaningful as a long-term portent, in view of the general temper of Congress and the general situation.

(2) There will be greater international stability. I believe that a growing number of major countries outside the United States will have gotten over their worst growing pains and therefore will represent substantial and more stable markets for our goods. More major countries will have the kind of expectations, the standards of living, and the standards of education that will make them of interest to U.S. investors.

(3) We are going to have a stable U.S. economy, with no major recessions.

(4) In our affluent society we will be able to spend whatever we need to spend to make education and learning serve society fully and at all levels. By "all levels" I mean from the cradle to the grave. This is not to condone wastefulness or inefficiency. It is, however, to emphasize the value of investing in human beings. A human being is, for my money, the most important and almost the only capital we have. I am deeply convinced that money spent for the education of any human being is very well spent, and this ties in with my first prediction—that once we are in a more peaceful situation there will be a large release of funds.

(5) We will have more centralized government. The big challenges like defense, economics, education, transportation, and air and water pollution transcend state lines. They are too big to be handled piecemeal. Efforts to meet the challenge may start on a regional basis, between states, but I think the federal government will have to step in.

(6) The federal government will be more strongly entrenched than ever financially, and regional associations sponsored both by the states and by the federal government will assume increasingly the role now played by individual states. At the same time, large metropolitan or urban centers will continue

to be islands that find association with each other more constructive and productive than association within their own state or region. I think that New York City has a lot more in common with Philadelphia or Chicago than it has with the rest of New York State. I think the association of cities—big urban centers with common problems—makes great sense, just as the association of big states, such as New York, Connecticut, and New Jersey, makes sense.

(7) This country's major domestic concern will be to improve the quality of American life. In 1967 our major domestic concerns were poverty and education. In 1977 these will still be major concerns, but we will have comparable programs to improve cities; to create new transportation systems; to control air pollution, water pollution, and noise; and to increase the country's cultural wealth.

I believe that the U.S. business and industrial machine is one of man's greatest creations. It runs incredibly well and not only supports America in most affluent fashion but maintains a large military machine and a sizable foreign aid program as well. It is a great tribute to the American business community that we have such a machine and that it works as well as it does.

But its future—its continued smooth running—is, in my opinion, no longer dependent on the factors that have made it what it is today; it depends, rather, on resolution of some of the larger issues that are eating away at the heart and soul of American society. I mean our big-city ghettos, environmental control, and economic and social assimilation of minority groups—Puerto Ricans, Negroes, Mexicans—to name three problems that are very much in the news and right on the surface. These can and will destroy our business system if we don't do something about them. I hope that the business community does not stand aside and wait for someone else to act. The talent and enterprise that have contributed so much to our business system need to be employed in the solution of these other problems as well, and I predict, therefore, that the American business community will in the decade ahead involve itself deeply with these issues. If it does not, we will, I feel, be in for some radical changes.

(8) The school program in the United States will have been extended at the lower end to grades "minus 1 and 2." Instead of starting first grade at age 6, all children will start to school at age 4. At the same time schooling will have been extended at the upper end to grades 13 and 14, with the open-door-college concept pretty much accepted universally. Fourteen to 16 years of schooling will be required.

(9) There will be a greater diversity in education. I think the innovators will have more influence than they have now; yet many schools will not change at all. And that means that the range of things we will be doing in the fields of publishing and production of materials will be even greater than it is now.

(10) Computer-based information systems will be operative long before 1977—probably by 1972. The computers will make obsolete many of the present forms of collecting and disseminating information, and leadership in the information business will be with the organizations that can process and transmit data in many different forms. The federal government will be a big factor in this business. In this connection, I think it is going to be difficult to work out an ideal system whereby copyrighted material can be stored and delivered by computers—difficult but not impossible. Good first steps in that direction are already being made.

(11) The federal government will probably create an extremely important enterprise known as the National Institute of Learning, similar in its independence and its functioning to the National Institutes of

Health. This will be a national research and development center in the areas of learning, genetic psychology, anthropology, and other social and behavioral sciences, but its focus will be on the child and the school; its objective will be to help create and provide ever-higher standards of useful and effective education. This is just a guess, but I have a very strong feeling that by 1977 this national center will be a reality.

(12) A considerably greater percentage of the national income will be devoted to the pursuit of culture and self-improvement than is now the case. This will, of course, result in large part from the enormous increase in leisure time, coupled with the high degree of affluence, that will especially characterize this country and Europe. I mean all of Europe—western and eastern—as well as the U.S.S.R.

You can draw your own conclusions as to what this will mean to the publishing industry if we are doing the job I think we ought to be doing in supplying interesting and useful printed materials for people who have more time and money than they have ever had before in their lives, a need to know more things than they have ever had to know before, and the desire to be productive and useful.

(13) There will be much more updating of material things, such as we now have in our automotive industry: we add some modifications and call it the 1968 model. Along with this, there will be more disposables—disposable clothing, disposable housing, and, of course, disposable books.

FORESEEABLE TRENDS

Now, having made these predictions, I want to discuss some of the forces which will affect the future if the predictions come true.

The first force is education in general and the concept of a continuous-learning society in particular—one in which the individual never stops learning. Continuous education must be the overriding institution of society. We have no choice. We cannot tolerate illiteracy; economically we cannot afford it because a literate man can produce not only something for himself but generally something for someone else. In addition, in a society where everyone votes, it pays to have the voter know something.

We are also faced with the geometric increase in information. It continues to proliferate at a fantastic rate, and it is the job of education to teach people how to separate the important from the unimportant, how to find the information they must have, and finally how to use information.

Another force that will be important in the years ahead is the individualization of instruction and learning—individual study. We are talking no longer about a class of 30 pupils but about a learning area with 30 individuals in it. There is a big difference; in one case we are talking about teaching a group, and in the other we are talking about reaching every person in the group as directly as possible in an effort to meet his individual needs as completely as possible.

In the publishing business, this will mean that materials will proliferate in a fashion that we are just now beginning to experience. The old single textbook, while still in use in many places—if not most—will be supplemented, possibly replaced, by an abundance of other printed materials—manuals, pamphlets, paperbacks, and, I suspect, some forms that haven't yet been invented.

But the student and the teacher will also have at their disposal a host of other learning materials, some printed on film, some recorded on disks or magnetic tapes—and, of course, there is always the probability that they will have access to a computer terminal.

We are well on our way to individualized, independent instruction in the classroom and outside it, with teachers and without teachers. While somewhere between 5 and 7

million students are now enrolled in correspondence courses in the United States, I believe we have just begun to see the application of this old, old teaching technique. New discoveries in learning theory and the application of these in the field of educational technology make independent study by correspondence more feasible, more viable than ever before.

Other forces that will affect the future of education in our society are the development of new firms and enterprises in the fields of publishing and the production of instructional materials, through acquisition, merger, and innovation. My own company, McGraw-Hill, has acquired a wide range of enterprises outside of traditional book publishing. We now produce films, filmstrips, and transparencies, and we build and install a planetarium that incidentally provides the institution that buys it with a completely controlled

environment for large-group instruction. The domed structure has controlled temperature, controlled lighting, and controlled sound, and constitutes a hemispheric screen on which anything can be projected. We also produce standardized tests, and are working on a system of evaluation for establishing their validity. McGraw-Hill, of course, is not alone in these efforts. Random House and L. W. Singer are now part of RCA; Holt, Rinehart and Winston is part of CBS; the American Book Company is part of Litton Industries. On and on it goes. I am convinced that this movement will produce a quiet revolution that will greatly benefit education in this country and throughout the world.

Still another force, and one about which there is great talk, is the application of the systems concept to instruction and instructional materials. There is nothing complicated or mysterious about this. It simply

means that more than ever before we are defining the objectives of instruction for a given person for a given subject, and then utilizing it in a rational manner all the tools available in the wide field of instructional material to meet that objective.

Finally, there is the need for education in the vast and developing world of emerging nations. All the means and materials I have talked about will be used in resolving the issues and solving the problems that this challenge presents. In addition, the transmission of information by satellite and by other microelectronic means will surely become increasingly important.

All these trends, together, make the world of publishing, as we have called it in the past, not only an exciting challenge, but one that needs—that demands—a higher order of intelligence, talent, and dedication, to say nothing of financial resources.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 20, 1968

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

Rev. John H. Albrecht, St. Katherine's Episcopal Church, Williamston, Mich., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Ruler of all the peoples of the earth, help us to understand that most of our problems of uncertainties, edginess, and upheaval are increased by the rapid acceleration of the pace of our lives.

Help us to understand that we must, therefore, respond to our problems quickly, decisively, and bravely.

Help us to understand that we must rid ourselves of pampered permissiveness, lawlessness, and the idea that anything goes.

Help us to understand that what is now needed is soundness, stability in the Nation, confidence, respect, order, and responsible action.

For the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives we ask Your fairest gifts. Grant to them a vision equal to the tasks that lie before them, and strength and courage adequate to their vision. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

- H.R. 5199. An act for the relief of James E. Denman;
- H.R. 9568. An act for the relief of Lucien A. Murzyn;
- H.R. 10050. An act for the relief of Capt. Russell T. Randall;
- H.R. 10058. An act for the relief of Mrs. Esther D. Borda;
- H.R. 10199. An act for the relief of Lloyd W. Corbisier;
- H.R. 10655. An act for the relief of Arthur Anderson;
- H.R. 11166. An act for the relief of Earl S. Haldeman, Jr.; and
- H.R. 12073. An act for the relief of John Allunario.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in

which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

- H.R. 14907. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; and
- H.R. 15345. An act to provide security measures for banks and other financial institutions.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

- S. 839. An act for the relief of the village of Orleans, Vt.;
- S. 986. An act for the relief of Edward L. Pickren;
- S. 1274. An act for the relief of Donald C. Goewey;
- S. 1299. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to permit regulation of the amount of credit that may be extended and maintained with respect to securities that are not registered on a national securities exchange;
- S. 2499. An act to extend the act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees;
- S. 2860. An act for the relief of Maj. Clyde Nichols (retired); and
- S. 3656. An act to extend the life of the Advisory Commission on Parcel Distribution Services, and for other purposes.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, JUNE 25, TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 17989, THE HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1968

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Tuesday, June 25, to file a report on H.R. 17989, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE PROBLEM OF POVERTY ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, as I have previously pointed out in my comments with regard to H.R. 10218, this bill would solve the problem of poverty on Indian reservations by granting a tax incentive to any industry which would move onto an Indian reservation and provide employment for the Indian people.

It is the answer and the only answer to Indian poverty. It is the answer and only answer to creating incentive to improve the individual Indian's outlook on life.

The program proved itself in Puerto Rico where Government agencies reported in "The Stricken Land" that the island today has the highest per capita income of any Latin American country only because a similar tax incentive was provided. This can be done on every Indian reservation in the country. These people can lift themselves up by their own bootstraps if a tax incentive is provided.

The Department in their report of June 6 on H.R. 10218 tells Congress that it is doing a tremendous job of getting industry onto reservations without such an incentive. There are approximately 240 Indians employed on reservations in South Dakota through industries for which the Bureau was at least partly responsible. With an Indian population of some 35,000—240 is a pretty sad record.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, it was necessary for me to be absent on May 28 during rollcalls Nos. 156 and 157. I would like the RECORD to show that had I been present, I would have voted in the affirmative on each rollcall.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.